

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLVII

MAY, 1932

Number 5

DOPPELDRUCKE VON GOETHE'S *NEUEN SCHRIFTEN*, 1792-1800

Erster Band, 1792 (1800)

Von diesem Bande liegen mir vier Drucke vor, je zwei mit dem Datum 1792 (N^{1.2}) und 1800 (N^{3.4}). Da mein Exemplar des Originaldrucks N¹ vollständiger ist als die von Hirzel und Meyer benutzten, so möge hier die Kollation folgen: 1 Bl. Titel: *Goethe's neue Schriften. Erster Band. Mit einem Kupfer. Mit Kurfürstl. Sächs. Privilegium. Berlin. Bei Johann Friedrich Unger. 1792.* Zweiter Titel: *Der Groß-Cophtha. Ein Lustspiel in fünf Aufzügen von Goethe. Berlin. Bey Johann Friedrich Unger. 1792.* S. 1-224, 223, 224, 225-241, darnach drei leere Seiten. Schluß des Groß-Cophtha auf S. 241; S. 245: *Des Joseph Balsamo, genannt Cagliostro, Stammbaum.* Von S. 248 springt die Seitenzählung auf 349, läuft so bis 464 (Schluß des römischen Carnevals); darauf 1 Bl. Inhalt und 1 Kupfer (Cagliostros Stammbaum). Bogen A bis Aa, 8°. Der Halbbogen Q enthält 5 bedruckte und 3 leere Seiten; hierdurch wurde die in der Weimarer Ausgabe (Bd. 17, S. 363) nicht erwähnte Einzel-Ausgabe des Groß-Cophtha ermöglicht: man brauchte nur den Band-Titel zu entfernen, um die Einzel-Ausgabe herzustellen. Hierin stimmt auch der Druck N² überein, für den überhaupt auch die sonstige Kollation von N¹ gilt. Anzunehmen ist also, daß unter den existierenden Exemplaren des Einzeldrucks 1792 auch solche vorkommen werden, die nicht den Text des Originaldrucks N¹, sondern den des Doppeldrucks N² aufweisen. Überhaupt muß der Doppeldruck N² sehr früh veranstaltet worden sein, da ich zwei Misch-Exemplare in altem Einbände besitze, deren Bogen A-Q vom Satze N², Bogen R-Aa dagegen vom Originalsatz N¹ abgezogen sind. Von einem solchen Misch-Exemplare stammt auch der folgende Druck N³ ab:

N³: *Goethe's neue Schriften. Erster Band. Mit einem Kupfer. Berlin. Bei Johann Friedrich Unger. 1800.* Seitenzählung: 1-66, 76, 68-224, 223, 224, 225-240 (Schluß des Groß-Cophta); dann drei unbezeichnete Seiten, darauf 248-258, 359-361, 365, 363-366, 267, 368, 369, 270, 371, 272, 373, 374, 275-290, 391-395, 963, 397-423, 454, 425-464. 1 Bl. Inhalt, 1 Kupfer. Das erste, unbezeichnete und nur einseitig bedruckte Blatt des Bogens P fehlt den meisten Exemplaren: *Der Groß-Cophta. Ein Lustspiel in fünf Aufzügen* (ohne Punkt). Dieses Blatt kann kaum als Ersatz des ersten Blattes des Bogens A gedacht sein, dessen Rückseite das Verzeichniß der Personen enthält.

N⁴: der Titel dieses Druckes stimmt mit N³ überein, nur hat N⁴ vor dem Worte *Berlin* einen spitz auslaufenden Strich, während dieser in N³ gerade ist. N⁴ wurde seitengleich von N³ abgesetzt, zählt aber richtig 362 Seiten.

Bei folgender Auswahl aus den mir vollständig vorliegenden Lesarten der vier Drucke wurden erstens solche Stellen berücksichtigt, die für die Textgeschichte in Betracht kommen, und zweitens solche, die durch Druck- oder Satzfehler die Unterscheidung etwa ähnlicher Drucke ermöglichen; nach der Stellenangabe folgt, in Klammern, Seite und Zeile der Weimarer Ausgabe; die dort gegebenen Siglen werden auch hier benutzt: S. 13, 12 (*Groß-Cophta*, W. Bd. 17, S. 125, 11) Getümmel! N¹ Getümmel? N²⁻⁴A-CW 14, 10 (125, 24) herein gekommen N^{1,2}A herein gekommen N^{3,4} 18, 13 (127, 24) nicht Ein N¹ nicht ein N²⁻⁴A-CW Z. 19 (128, 1) Thörichter N^{1,3,4} Thörigter N² 30, 4 (134, 3) Ist er er schon N² Drf. 40, 9 (140, 12) verlohren N¹ verloren N²⁻⁴ entsprechend 44, 4 (142, 11) 56, 13 (148, 25) fragt N¹ fragt N²⁻⁴ 62, 17 (152, 5) könnte? N¹ könnte. N²⁻⁴ 66, 2 (153, 24) wie N¹ wie N²⁻⁴ 82, 20 (162, 24) fürchten? N¹ fürchten! N²⁻⁴ 90, 16 (167, 2) kvnnte N¹ Drf. 91, 12 (167, 16) übrige N¹ Uebrige N²⁻⁴ 102, 2 (174, 21) viele N¹ viel N²⁻⁴ 103, 19 (175, 16) Hier! N¹ Hier, N²⁻⁴ 109, 10 (178, 13) nicht anders N¹ nichts anders N²⁻⁴A 112, 13 (180, 5) Ihnen N^{1,4} ihnen N^{2,3} 118, 3 (182, 25) unversöhnliche N^{1,2,4} unversönliche N³ 134, 17 (191, 18) kreutzweise N¹ kreuzweise N²⁻⁴ 138, 11 (194, 2) Ungedult N¹ Ungeduld N²⁻⁴ 140, 7.8 (195, 2) entscheidendsten N¹ entscheidensten N²⁻⁴ 155, 3 (202, 10) mögt' N¹ möcht' N²⁻⁴ 169, 1 (209, 24) einen N^{1,4} einem N^{2,3} Drf. Z. 3 (Z. 26) von ihm N^{1,4} von ihn N^{2,3} Drf. 170, 18

(210, 21) Scheri N¹ Drf. Scherz N²⁻⁴ 181, 11 (216, 3) Rltter N¹ Drf. Ritter N²⁻⁴ Rittter N³ Drf. 191, 9 (221, 7) heute Nacht N^{1.2} diese Nacht N^{3.4} 193, 3 (222, 8) zustchern N¹ Drf. 194, 17 (223, 11) ihn recht dünkt N^{1.2}AB¹ ihm recht dünkt N^{3.4}BC¹CW 199, 2 (226, 16) großeu N¹ Drf. Z. 16 (227, 1) Oberst N¹B¹ Obrist N²⁻⁴ABC¹CW 203, 10 (228, 23) zu gefallen N¹ zu Gefallen N²⁻⁴ 214, 1 (234, 25) Oberst N¹ Oberster N²⁻⁴AW *entsprechend* Z. 9 (235, 1). 216, 1 (235, 21). 217, 1 (236, 8). 218, 11 (237, 3). 224, 10 (240, 12). 229, 14 (244, 5) 216, 9 (235, 26) jeden N^{1.3.4} jedem N² Drf. 220, 14 (238, 11) er N¹ Er N²⁻⁴ 221, 3 (238, 18) Er N^{1.2} er N^{3.4} Z. 17 (239, 1) Abendteuer N¹ Abenteuer N²⁻⁴ 223, 19 (240, 6) Oberst N¹ Obrister N²⁻⁴ Oberster AW 224, 12 (240, 13) nun schon N¹ nur schon N²⁻⁴AW 228, 3 (243, 7) Hofjuwilieren N¹ Hofjuwelieren N²⁻⁴ 230, 5 (244, 14) übergebe N^{1.3.4} über gebe N² 237, 17 (248, 11) Triumpfe N^{1.3.4} Triumphe N² 238, 3 (248, 15) sie . . . Ihnen N¹ Sie . . . ihnen N²⁻⁴ 240, 16. 17 (250, 1.2) ihren . . . ihre N¹ Ihren . . . Ihre N²⁻⁴

S. 350, 2 (*Cagliostro's Stammbaum*, W. 31. Bd. S. 128, 6) andre N^{1.3.4} andere N² 351, 14 (129, 4) ohngefehr N^{1.3} ohngefähr N²⁻⁴ 353, 3 (130, 1) sizilianischen N^{1.3.4} sicilianischen N²A 354, 7 (130, 22) mehreren N^{1.3.4} mehreren N² 356, 7 (132, 3) Betrogne, Halbbetrogne N^{1.3.4} Betrogene, Halbbetrogene N²A 358, 8 (133, 10) qualifizire N^{1.3.4} qualificire N²A Z. 12 (Z. 14) Negotiazion N^{1.3.4} Negoziation N²A 361, 4 (135, 4) schien N^{1.2} scheint N^{3.4} 362, 17 (136, 5) zum sitzen N^{1.3.4} zum Sitzen N²A 364, 1 (136, 27) herein gekommen N¹ hereingekommen N²A hinein gekommen N^{3.4} Z. 12 (137, 9) Angen N¹ Drf. 366, 1 (138, 7) wolle N^{1.2}A wollte N^{3.4} Z. 10 (Z. 14) Brief abzuholen N^{1.3.4} Brief selbst abzuholen N²AW Z. 14 (Z. 17) werde, N¹ werde; N²⁻⁴ *zwei Exx. von N¹ teilen diese Lesart* 378, 5 (301, 3) Schester N¹ Drf. Z. 17 (Z. 12) Snmme N¹ Drf.

S. 401, 5 (*Römisches Carneval*, W. 32. Bd. S. 231, 22) für N^{1.3.4} vor N²A 403, 10 (233, 7) Classe N^{1.3.4} Klasse N²A 413, 15 (239, 12) colossalischen N^{1.3.4} colassalischen N² 427, 13 (248, 3) hie N^{1.3.4} hier N²A 431, 8 (250, 13) Unzählich N^{1.3.4} Unzählig N² 432, 14 (251, 9) unversehens N^{1.2.4} unversehns N³ 442, 6 (257, 10) ungeduldig N^{1.2} unbändig N^{3.4}

446, 15 (260, 6) letzte mal N^{1.3.4} letztmal N² 459, 5 (267, 27) Komplimente N^{1.3.4} Kompliment N²AW Z. 16 (268, 9) aus benachbarte N^{1.3.4} Drf. ans benachbarte N²A 461, 1 (269, 3) schwindeln N^{1.3.4} schwindlen N²A Z. 2 (Z. 4) unmöglich. N¹ Drf. unmöglich, N² unmöglich N^{3.4}

Der Doppeldruck N² wurde Vorlage, und somit Fehlerquelle für A, wie z. B. aus den Stellen 199, 16. 214, 1. 223, 19. 366, 10. 459, 5 leicht zu erkennen ist. Von den Herausgebern der Weimarer Ausgabe (Bd. 17, 31, 32) sind die Doppeldrucke nicht beachtet worden, trotzdem schon Wilhelm Vollmer im Jahre 1868¹ das Vorhandensein und den schädlichen Einfluß der Doppeldrucke der folgenden Bände der Neuen Schriften nachgewiesen hatte. Die meisten der von N² im ersten Bande eingeführten Druckfehler gehen von A auf die späteren Ausgaben über: daß sie aus dem heutigen Texte entfernt werden müssen, braucht kaum betont zu werden. Man vergleiche zum Beispiel das Wort *Oberst*, welches im *Groß-Cophtha* meistens in dieser Schreibweise, stellenweise auch als *Oberster*, und ganz vereinzelt als *Obrist* vorkommt. Anstatt zu normieren, mengt N² diese Formen noch mehr durch einander: an einer Stelle (vgl. die oben gegebenen Lesarten) führt N² anstatt *Oberst* die Form *Obrist* ein, welche sich bis in die Weimarer Ausgabe erhalten hat; ein andermal setzt N² die Form *Obrister*, die dann in A-CW als *Oberster* erscheint. An sieben weiteren Stellen setzt N² für *Oberst* die Form *Oberster*, die sich dann jedesmal in ABCW wiederfindet. Die Schreibweise der späteren Ausgaben wurde also hauptsächlich durch N² festgelegt. Dabei handelt es sich keineswegs um eine Normierung, denn die Form *Oberst* findet sich immer noch am zahlreichsten. Reine Druckfehler, die unbedingt auszumerzen sind, sind ferner die Stellen 224, 12 nur schon; 366, 10 Brief selbst abzuholen; 458, 5 Kompliment.

Zweiter Band, 1794

N¹: *Goethe's neue Schriften. Zweyter Band. Mit Kurfürstl. Sächs. Privilegium. Berlin. Bei Johann Friedrich Unger. 1794. Titel, 491 Seiten, 1 Bl. Druckfehler. Bogen A-Hh, 8°. S. [1]: Reinecke Fuchs in zwölf Gesängen. S. [3]: Erster Gesang. Es gibt Exemplare auf besserem und schlechterem Papier: erstere*

¹ "Zur Geschichte und Kritik des Goethe'schen Textes," Beilage zur *Allgemeinen Zeitung*, Augsburg, No. 103, 1868.

messen unbeschnitten 175 x 120 mm., bei einer Stärke von 27–35 mm.; von Bogen Q an liegt ein anderes Papier vor, welches nur 110 mm. Breite aufweist. Ein Exemplar auf schlechtem Papier hat eine Stärke von nur 19 mm., auch fehlt diesem das Druckfehlerverzeichnis. Anstatt 72, 248, 255, 313, 463 stehen in allen meinen Exemplaren die Seitenzahlen 62, 148, 257, 413, 492, während die erste Ziffer der Zahl 84 schief steht. In der Weimarer Ausgabe Bd. 50, S. 353 erwähnt H. G. Gräf zwei Gattungen von abweichenden Exemplaren, die sich in den Bogen Y, Cc und Dd (N^{1a}) und Aa (N^{1b}) von den übrigen unterscheiden; die Lesarten von N^{1a} sind mit im Apparate verzeichnet, von dem damals schon verschollenen Exemplare N^{1b} werden nur zwei Lesarten angegeben. Ein Exemplar in meinem Besitz, und zwar das oben erwähnte auf schlechtem Papier, weist nun in acht Bogen (C, Y, Z, Aa, Bb, Cc, Dd, Ee) abweichende Lesarten auf, mit welchen die von Gräf für N^{1a} verzeichneten übereinstimmen. Stellenweise scheint neuer Satz vorzuliegen, der sich jedoch nie auf einen ganzen Bogen erstreckt: demnach liegt Presskorrektur vor. Folglich sollten die neuen Lesarten die korrekteren sein, was sich jedoch nicht immer behaupten läßt. Dabei ist zu bemerken, daß die mir vorliegenden Exemplare einheitlich zusammengestellt sind, zwei Exemplare auf besserem Papier haben übereinstimmend die mit N¹ bezeichneten Lesarten, das Exemplar mit den Lesarten N^{1a} besteht durchweg aus Bogen, die auf schlechterem Papier gedruckt sind. Möglicherweise werden noch andere Exemplare auftauchen, welche die korrigierten Bogen in anderer Zusammenstellung aufweisen. Lesarten: S. 38, 19 (Weim. Ausg. Bd. 50, Reineke Fuchs II, 15) holen N¹ hohlen N^{1a} N^{2.3} 344, 15 (IX, 358) entschuld'gen N^{1.2.3} entschuldigen N^{1a} 355, 3.4 (X, 38) wird | er im N^{1.2} wird er | im N^{1a} 361, 9 (X, 97) Hecktor N¹ Hektor N^{1a} N² 365, 11 (X, 136) er eilte N^{1.2} Drf. es eilte N^{1a} 369, 11 (X, 175) Aengstlich N^{1.2} Aenstlich N^{1a} Drf. 389, 10 (X, 364) Hälfte N¹ Hälfte, N^{1a} N² 390, 17 (X, 378) gebiethet N^{1.2} gebietet N^{1a} 391, 13 (X, 386) Hällte N¹ Drf. Hälfte N^{1a} N² 392, 4 (X, 391) sagte N¹ Drf. sage N^{1a} N² 396, 1 (X, 426) Thell N¹ Drf. Theil N^{1a} N² 398, 9 (X, 449) Dankbar, N^{1.2} Dankbar N^{1a} 400, 8 (X, 466) wundern! N^{1.2} wundern? N^{1a} 407, 7 (XI, 21) Einen N¹ Einem N^{1a} N² 408, 5 (XI, 30) im kalten N¹ im kaltem N^{1a} Drf. 411, 14 (XI, 63) freylich N¹ freilich N^{1a} 412, 5 (XI, 69) ihm N¹ Drf. ihn N^{1a} N² 412, 9 (XI, 71) hab' N¹ hab N^{1a}

413, 18 (XI, 85) läugnen N¹ leugnen N^{1a} **415**, 7 (XI, 100) beschädigt N^{1.2} AB¹ beschädigt N^{1a} N³ W **416**, 1 (XI, 107) Gevatterin N^{1.2} Gavatterinn N^{1a} **416**, 3 (XI, 108) in dem N^{1.2} Drf. in den N^{1a} **416**, 13 (XI, 113) ihr kam N¹ Drf. ihr kamt N^{1a} N² **421**, 8 (XI, 158) ehr' N^{1.2} ehr N^{1a} **424**, 9 (XI, 188) abscheuliches N^{1.2} Abscheuliches N^{1a} W **426**, 17 (XI, 212) bezeugte N^{1.2} bezeugte N^{1a} **427**, 2 (XI, 213) Närrin N^{1.2} Närrinn N^{1a} **429**, 7 (XI, 236) beynahe N^{1.2} beinahe N^{1a} **429**, 19 (XI, 242) erzeugt N^{1.2} erzeugt N^{1a} **430**, 17 (XI, 251) Wiederholt N^{1.2} Wiederholt N^{1a} **432**, 5 (XI, 265) versetzt N^{1.2} versetzt' N^{1a} **447**, 5 (XI, 407) den Dachs N¹ Drf. der Dachs N^{1a} N². Anstatt 421 hat N¹ die Seitenzahl 321, in N^{1a} ist sie richtiggestellt. Anzunehmen ist, daß andere Exemplare eine neue Zusammenstellung von korrigierten und unkorrigierten Bogen aufweisen werden, gerade wie dies bei dem 11. Bande der A-Ausgabe der Fall ist (vgl. *MLN.*, 1911, S. 137).

Die Doppeldrucke N², N³, denen das Druckfehlerverzeichnis fehlt, unterscheiden sich sonst nicht von dem Originaldruck N¹. Die unverkauften Exemplare von N³ wurden im Jahre 1822 als Einzelausgabe in den Handel gebracht: *Goethe's Reinecke Fuchs. In zwölf Gesängen. Leipzig: F. A. Brockhaus. 1822.* Dieser Titel wurde zweimal gedruckt: die eine Gattung hat vor dem Worte *Leipzig* einen spitz auslaufenden Strich, in der anderen findet sich ein dicker, gerader Strich. Lesarten: S. 8, 8 (I, 28) ätzenden N¹ ätzendem N^{2.3} **9**, 4 (I, 36) erzählen N^{1.2} erzahlen N³ **17**, 2 (I, 111) voraus N^{1.3} yoraus N² Drf. **20**, 17 (I, 149) Willen N^{1.3} Wtllen N² Drf. **25**, 13 (I, 197) Herr und König N^{1.2} König und Herr N³ **43**, 10 (II, 59) fern N^{1.3} ferne N² **54**, 11 (II, 166) mögt N^{1.2} möchte N³ **58**, 18 (II, 209) hinunter N^{1.2} herunter N³ **62**, 1 (II, 240) Handschnh N¹ Drf. **91**, 1 (III, 191) Sey es wie N¹ Sey wie N^{2.3} **102**, 7 (III, 301) Daß ich N¹ Und ich N^{2.3} **102**, 9 (III, 302) Und ich N¹ Daß ich N^{2.3} **127**, 1 (IV, 54) fürwahr N¹ führwahr N^{2.3} **152**, 11 (IV, 292) wißt N^{1.2} wüßt N³ **173**, 3 (V, 147) Mann, N¹ Man, N² Mann N³ **181**, 13 (V, 224) daran N¹ dran N^{2.3} **201**, 13 (VI, 96) mir N¹ nur N^{2.3} **205**, 18 (VI, 136) von Hofe N¹ vom Hofe N^{2.3} **212**, 5 (VI, 198) Geschmackes N^{1.2} Geschmacks N³ **222**, 17 (VI, 298) Hörtet N^{1.2} Höret N³ **240**, 15 (VII, 15) am besten N¹ am bestem N^{2.3} **244**, 1 (VII, 45) Seht vier Löcher N¹ Sehr viel Löcher N^{2.3} **252**, 11 (VII, 126) Lupardus

N^{1.2} Lapardus N³ 255, 13 (VII, 155) alle alle N^{1.2} Drf. alle N³ 304, 3 (VIII, 334) führ ich N^{1.3} für ich N² Drf. 320, 19 (IX, 133) kennen N^{1.2} nennen N³ 357, 9 (X, 59) erwieß N¹ erwies N^{2.3} 373, 17 (X, 216) bewieß, N¹ bewies, N² bewies; N³ 386, 2 (X, 332) erzeugen N^{1.2} erzeugen N³ 412, 19 (XI, 76) fürwahr N^{1.2} fürwahr N³ 460, 3 (XII, 85) brummte N^{1.2} brumte N³ 469, 1 (XII, 171) Bey N^{1.3} Bry N² Drf. 473, 7 (XII, 211) Verwandte N^{1.2} Verwandten N³. Der Druck N² hat als Vorlage für N³ gedient: auf die späteren Ausgaben haben die beiden Drucke keinen Einfluß gehabt.

Dritter Band.

N¹: *Goethe's neue Schriften. Dritter Band. Mit Kurfürstl. Sächs. Privilegium. Berlin. Bei Johann Friedrich Unger. 1795. Einzeltitel: Wilhelm Meisters Lehrjahre. Ein Roman. Herausgegeben von Goethe. Erster Band. Berlin. Bey Johann Friedrich Unger. 1795. 364 Seiten, 8°. Bogen A–Y zu je 16 Seiten, Bogen Z zu 8 Seiten, Bogen Aa zu 4 Seiten. Bogenorm: W. Meisters Lehrj. 3 Musikbeilagen. Es gibt Exemplare auf feinem, weißem, sowie auf grobem, grauem Papier. Ferner kommen Titelblätter vor, ohne Ungers Namen, nur mit der Angabe: Frankfurt und Leipzig. 1795. Auch hier ist der eigentliche Text von dem Originalsatz N¹ abgezogen. Der Zweck dieses Kunstgriffes war natürlich, den Nachdruckern das Handwerk zu legen.² Schließlich ist zu bemerken, daß die Bände 3–7 der Neuen Schriften nicht mit denselben Lettern gedruckt sind wie die vorhergehenden. Dies läßt sich schon daran erkennen, daß im 1. und 2. Bande durchweg ä, ö, û, vorkommen, während die späteren Bände durchweg ä, ö, ü aufweisen. Auch sonst, besonders bei den großen Buchstaben, lassen sich Unterschiede zwischen den Lettern nachweisen. Entweder hat also der Drucker zwischen 1792 und 1795 neues Material angeschafft, oder die späteren Bände sind in einer andern Offizin hergestellt.*

N², N³: hier gilt dieselbe Kollation, abgesehen davon, daß mir bei den Doppeldrucken keine Exemplare mit der Angabe *Frank-*

² Bei der ersten Ausgabe der *Jungfrau von Orleans* (1802) hat Unger genau dasselbe Verfahren beobachtet: der anscheinliche Nachdruck (*Frankfurt und Leipzig*) ohne Verlagsfirma, ist vom Originalsatze abgezogen, während die Exemplare mit Ungers Firma meistens späteren Satz aufweisen.

furt und Leipzig bekannt sind. Lesarten: S. 3, 1 (Weimarer Ausg. Bd. 21, S. 3, 1 Crstes Eapitel N² *Drf.* 4, 10 (3, 20) neusten N^{1.3} neuesten N² 8, 1 (6, 2) spotttend N³ *Drf.* 9, 6 (6, 21) herein N^{1.3} hinein N² A 13, 12 (9, 7) Geduld N^{1.3} B¹ Gedult N² AA¹ B 15, 9 (10, 9) vom großen N^{1.3} des großen N² A-C 15, 20 (10, 17) Büchelchen N^{1.3} Büchlein N² A-CW 27, 4 (17, 20) schien! N^{1.3} schien. N² AW 38, 3 (24, 5) Knabens N^{1.3} Knaben N² AW 56, 9 (35, 12) Zweifeln N^{1.2} Zweifel N³ 108, 19 (68, 25.26) weiten und langen N^{1.3} langen und weiten N² A-C 111, 21 (70, 20) bemächtigte! N^{1.3} B bemächtigte. N² A 133, 3 (83, 21) konnte mit N^{1.2} A konnte er mit N³ 190, 13 (120, 12) schmerzlosen N^{1.3} schmerzenlosen N² A-CW 297, 15 (187, 12) schon immer N^{1.2} noch immer N³ 327, 18 (205, 26) ihr hohe N^{1.3} ihr hohen N² A-W 355, 10 (224, 5) der Stärkere N^{1.2} der Stärkerer N³.

Der Doppeldruck N³ geht ohne Vermittelung von N² direkt auf N¹ zurück; dagegen hat N² als Vorlage, und somit Fehlerquelle, für A gedient. Diese Tatsache hatte schon Vollmer im Jahre 1868 (S. oben, Anm. 1) richtig erkannt und für die Textkritik verwertet: in der Weimarer Ausgabe sind Vollmers Resultate anerkannt, aber nicht immer befolgt worden. Man vergleiche zum Beispiel unter den oben angeführten Stellen die Lesarten zu 10, 17; 17, 20; 120, 12; 205, 26 (nach der Weimarer Ausgabe): an sämtlichen Stellen sollte die ursprüngliche Lesart von N¹ wieder hergestellt werden.

Vierter Band.

N¹: Titelblätter denen des dritten Bandes entsprechend. 374 Seiten, 1 Bl.: *Nachricht an den Buchbinder*, 2 Musikbeilagen. 8°. Bogen A-Aa, letzterer zu 4 Bll.; Bogenorm: *W. Meisters Lehrj.* 2. Dieselbe Kollation gilt für N^{2.3}, abgesehen davon, daß mir keine Exemplare mit der Angabe *Frankfurt und Leipzig* bekannt sind. Lesarten: S. 9, 4 (234, 13) Molodie N³ *Drf.* 11, 7 (235, 19) das N^{1.3} was N²-C 20, 11 (241, 4) empfand N^{1.2} entpfand N³ 21, 15 (241, 24) hinunter N^{1.3} herunter N² A-W 40, 3 (253, 1) sogleich N^{1.2} folglich N³ 54, 1 (261, 25) mache N^{1.3} machte N² A 115, 18 (299, 6) um N^{1.3} und N² AA¹ 124, 6 (304, 18) übermächtige N^{1.3} übermüthige N² A-C 125, 2 (305, 4) schlupfen N^{1.2} schlüpfen N³ A 133, 17 (310, 24) zeigen N^{1.3} zeigten N² A-W 153, 10 (322, 23) der Vorlesung N¹ A die Vor-

lesung N^{2.3} *Drf.* 167, 18 (W 22. Bd. S. 5, 27) meinen Zweifeln N^{1.3} meinen Zweifel N² A meinem Zweifel A¹ BC 181, 16 (14, 13) zuschickte, N¹ A zuschickte N² zuschickte; N³ 196, 1 (22, 26) Fähigkeit N^{1.3} A Fähigkeiten N² 210, 1 (31, 13) freute N¹ *Drf.* freute N² freute N³ 230, 5 (44, 21) des Verwundeten N^{1.3} A der Verwundeten N² 265, 15 (67, 1) *Vers eingerückt* N^{1.2} A-C nicht eingerückt N³ W 268, 14 (69, 5) allem diesem N¹ C allem diesen N^{2.3} A-C¹ W 275, 11 (73, 23) fühlt N^{1.3} A fühlte N² BC *Drf.* 317, 3 (98, 12) langer Weile N^{1.3} lange Weile N² 332, 10 (107, 15) ist es N¹ W es ist N^{2.3} A-C 349, 8 (117, 17) anscheinendem N^{1.3} B¹ anscheinenden N² ABC¹ CW 363, 3 (125, 25) vor ihnen N^{1.2} A von ihnen N³ 364, 12 (126, 22) lebhafteste N^{1.2} lebhaftigste N³ 373, 5 (132, 4) der Blitz N¹ den Blitz N² der Biltz N³.

Auch hier haben sich einige der von dem Doppeldruck N² eingeführten Lesarten bis in die Weimarer Ausgabe fortgepflanzt (vgl. oben zu Bd. 21, S. 241, 24; 310, 24; Bd. 22, S. 69, 5; 117, 17); an der zweiten von diesen Stellen handelt es sich um einen augenfälligen Druckfehler (*zeigten*): die richtige Lesart *zeigen* wird im Apparat nicht einmal erwähnt.

Fünfter Band.

N¹: Titelblätter denen des dritten Bandes entsprechend: 371 Seiten, 2 Musikbeilagen. 8°. Bogen A-Aa, letzterer zu 4 Seiten; Bogenorm: *W. Meisters Lehrj. 3.* Anstatt 263-268 stehen die Seitenzahlen 265-270. Von den sechs mir vorliegenden Exemplaren dieses Druckes sind zwei auf besserem, und vier auf schlechterem Papier gedruckt. Dieselbe Kollation gilt für N^{2.3}, abgesehen davon, daß mir keine Exemplare mit der Angabe *Frankfurt und Leipzig* bekannt sind. Auch der oben vermerkte Fehler in der Seitenzählung kommt hier nicht vor. In meinem Exemplar von N² gehört der letzte Bogen (Aa) zum Originaldruck N¹: falls die übrigen Exemplare hierin übereinstimmen, so wäre anzunehmen daß N² sofort nach Fertigstellung von N¹ angefangen worden sei. Wilhelm Vollmer (s. Anm. 1) kannte von diesem Bande nur den Doppeldruck N³, und da er feststellen konnte, daß die neuen Lesarten desselben sich nicht auf die Ausgabe A fortgeerbt hatten, so nahm er an, daß hier der Originaldruck N¹ als Vorlage für A gedient habe: "Wie schon erwähnt, wurde vom Dichter im Verlauf seiner Textrevision nicht der

Doppeldruck, sondern der echte Druck des dritten Bandes [d. h. der Lehrjahre] benützt, und somit blieb der betreffende Theil der "Lehrjahre" gegen eine Corruption von dieser Seite aus geschützt." In der Weimarer Ausgabe Bd. 21, S. 334, werden Vollmers Resultate blindlings gutgeheißen: "Einer dieser Doppeldrucke, hier N² genannt, ist für die Textgeschichte der Lehrjahre dadurch wichtig geworden, daß er und nicht der echte Druck bei der Textrevision für die Ausgabe A in den Bänden I, II und IV von N zu Grunde gelegt wurde, wodurch eine ganze Reihe von Fehlern in den Text gerieth." Im 22. Bande, S. 359, wird dann erkannt, daß auch für Bd. III der Lehrjahre N² als Fehlerquelle in Betracht kommt.

Lesarten: S. 12, 4 (138, 3) Ungewohntheit N^{1.3} Ungewohnheit N² A-C 15, 17 (140, 9) Leitsternen N^{1.3} A Lichtsternen N² 20, 14 (143, 20) konnte: N^{1.3} konnte; N² A 32, 16 (151, 18) sich N^{1.3} sie N² A 44, 3 (158, 23) Folge, N^{1.3} Folge N² A 44, 4 (158, 23) sind, N^{1.3} sind N² A 48, 10 (161, 9) leidiger N^{1.3} A lediger N² 52, 17 (164, 8) Ungeschicklichkeiten N¹ Unschicklichkeiten N^{2.3} A 67, 12 (172, 26) fand: N^{1.3} fand! N² AW 88, 17 (186, 7) Cndzweck N² Drf. 99, 4 (192, 20) Sie N^{1.3} A¹ B¹ sie N² AB 100, 4 (193, 12) was anderm N^{1.2} was andern N³ 104, 9 (196, 3) beleidigt; N^{1.3} beleidigt: N² AW 112, 8 (200, 22) so einer N^{1.2} einer so N³ 122, 18 (207, 5) Hand N^{1.3} Hand, N² AW 122, 19 (207, 6) drauf N^{1.3} darauf N² AW 133, 10 (214, 12) mußte N³ Drf. 142, 12 (219, 25) Rockermel N^{1.2} Rockärmel N³ 145, 1 (221, 12) gesehn N² Drf. 146, 19 (222, 17) ihm freundlich N^{1.2} Drf. ihn freundlich N³ A 153, 1 (226, 5) Sie versichern N^{1.2} Ihnen versichern N³ 154, 6 (226, 26) draus N^{1.3} W daraus N² A-C: vgl. oben zu 122, 19 162, 8 (232, 1) neu angenommene N^{1.3} B¹ W neuangenommene N² ABC¹ C 171, 5 (237, 7) gleichsam N^{1.3} C¹ C gleichfalls N² AA¹ 175, 16 (239, 27) Officer N² Drf. 183, 21 (244, 23. 24) nie . . . befunden fehlt in einem Exemplare von N³, weil N¹, dem N³ zeilengleich folgte, hier ausnahmsweise 21 anstatt 20 Zeilen auf der Seite hat 186, 13 (246, 13) Wilhem N¹ Drf. 187, 16 (247, 4) der Sache N^{1.3} A die Sache N² 233, 15 (275, 2) erschrak N¹ erschrack N^{2.3} 237, 19 (277, 16) Mama N^{1.2} Mamma N³ 250, 14 (285, 6) allem dem N^{1.2} allen dem N³ 252, 10 (286, 10) vor kurzen N^{1.2} vor kurzem N³ 269, 13

(296, 18) weitläufigen N^{1.2}A weitläufigen N³BW 270, 8
 (297, 3) Ihm N^{1.2}AB ihm N³CC¹W 279, 2 (302, 8) so reizend
 N^{1.2}AB¹ zu reizend N³BC¹CW 285, 20 (306, 9) in reinen
 N^{1.2} im reinen N³ in reinem A-CW 289, 7 (308, 9) graute mich
 N^{1.2} graute mir N³A 294, 2 (311, 4) Empfindung N^{1.2} Empfin-
 dung N³ 319, 9 (326, 6) verstund N^{1.3} verstand N²A-CW
 349, 2 (343, 23) Kathar N^{1.2} Katharr N³ 354, 12 (347, 1) mir
 nicht N^{1.3}A nicht mir N².

Hier gleichfalls haben sich Lesarten von N² bis in die Weimarer Ausgabe fortgepflanzt: man vergleiche zum Beispiel die oben angeführten Stellen (nach der Weimarer Ausgabe) 172, 26; 196, 3; 207, 5; 207, 6; 326, 6. Hauptsächlich handelt es sich hier um Interpunktion und Schreibweise.

Sechster Band.

N¹: Titelblätter denen des dritten Bandes entsprechend, nur mit dem Datum 1796. 1 Blatt, 507 Seiten, 2 Bl. Verlagsanzeigen, 1 Bl. Musikbeilage. Die Seitenzahlen 263, 386, 422 sind verdruckt in 265, 286, 402. Bogen A-Ii, 8°. Die Bogen A-N sind ohne Norm, O-Ii haben die Norm W. Meisters Lehrj. 4.

N²: der einzige mir bekannte Doppeldruck hat dieselbe äußerliche Einrichtung, abgesehen davon, daß der Einzeltitel das Datum 1795 trägt. Auch sind die Seitenzahlen richtig, während sämtliche Bogen die Norm: W. Meisters Lehrj. 4. aufweisen. Der Druck N² hat als Vorlage und Fehlerquelle für A gedient. Lesarten: S. 19, 20 (Weim. Ausg. Bd. 23, S. 10, 21) Laertes N¹ Laertes N² 38, 8 (22, 14) Brüdergemeinde N¹A¹ Brüdergemeine HN²ABB¹C¹C 50, 8 (30, 6) Wilhelm N¹ Drf. 51, 20 (31, 4) wußte N¹ wußte, N²-CW 66, 3 (39, 19.20) wir selbst N¹A nur selbst N² 70, 21 (42, 17) wundern N¹W, fehlt N² verwundern A-C: das Wort, welches in N¹ als einziges auf der 21. Zeile steht, fiel in N² aus, weil die Seite in der Regel nur 20 Zeilen enthält 73, 14 (44, 12) Weste N¹W Welt N²-C 84, 16 (51, 6) erfahren! N¹BB¹C erfahren? N²AA¹ 113, 16 (68, 3) Vermächtniß. N¹BB¹ Vermächtniß; N²AA¹ 131, 6 (78, 22) hierher N¹B¹ hieher N²AA¹BC¹C 139, 15 (83, 26) noch Einmal HN¹ noch einmal N²-CW 142, 14 (86, 4) Ankommenden; N¹ Ankommenden: N²-CW 143, 12 (86, 21) lassen Sie N¹B¹C¹CW lassen sie N²AA¹B 154, 14 (93, 9) Abend, als N¹BC¹CW Abend als N²AA¹B¹ 161, 3 (97, 7)

ich N¹ und N² und ich A-C 236, 2 (144, 16) einzudrängen N¹ A einzudringen N² 249, 12 (152, 26) sahe N¹ sah N² A-CW 266, 7 (163, 21) edlen, N¹ edlen N² A-CW 272, 4 (167, 8) aber, wenn N¹ aber wenn N² A-CW 284, 20 (174, 21) glücklich N² Drf. 290, 15 (178, 5) auszusprechen, N¹ auszusprechen N² A-CW 293, 18 (180, 2) Frrundin N² Drf. 329, 12 (201, 20) lange N¹ lango N² 330, 19 (202, 15) läßt N¹ läßt N² A 367, 14 (225, 4) gerauft N¹ A getauft N² 378, 12 (231, 17) Gemahl, N¹ Gemahl N² A-CW 384, 14 (236, 4) Willhelm N¹ Drf. 391, 5 (240, 2) Mädchen N² Drf. 399, 4 (244, 25) sie in N¹ W sich in N² sie sich in A-C 433, 13 (265, 26) äustersten N¹ Drf. 436, 5 (267, 14) Schlachopfer N¹ Schlachtopfer N² A 439, 2 (269, 6) Da! N¹ Da N² A-CW 439, 8 (269, 11) bequemem N¹ bequemen N² A-CW 451, 7 (276, 13) Papst N¹ BC¹ CW Pabst N² AA¹ B¹ 478, 19 (293, 3) Mister N¹ W Meister N² A-C 480, 18 (294, 6) hafte N¹ A hofte N² 487, 6 (297, 28) Schermesser N¹ B Scheermesser N² AA¹ 490, 14 (300, 1) Kind: N¹ Kind; N² Kind, A-CW.

Viele Lesarten von N², hauptsächlich die Interpunktion betreffend, haben sich bis in die Weimarer Ausgabe fortgepflanzt (vgl. Bd. 23, S. 31, 4; 83, 26; 86, 4; 163, 21; 167, 8; 178, 5; 231, 17; 269, 6; 300, 1).

Vom 7. Bande, 1800, sind keine Doppeldrucke bekannt: es ist also anzunehmen daß von diesem Bande sofort die größere Anzahl Exemplare abgezogen wurde, die nötig war, um die Doppeldrucke der früheren Bände zu komplettieren.

W. KURRELMMEYER

NOTES ON BROWNING'S *PAULINE*

Browning published *Pauline* anonymously in March 1833. Not a single copy was sold. He suppressed the poem, not I think because he was ashamed of its diction but because it was too confessional. He was almost fanatical in his belief that poetry should be "dramatic"; and *Pauline* revealed too much of his adolescent mind. He destroyed the larger part of the edition, with the result that *Pauline* is now one of the most valuable of modern books; a copy was sold recently for \$16,000. There are only 21 copies known.

In 1931 an edition of *Pauline*, containing a collation of the

texts of 1833, 1867 [date 1868], 1888, with introduction and notes, was published by the University of London Press, prepared by N. Hardy Wallis. It is unfortunate that he was unaware of the copy of the first edition in the Dyce and Forster Library at the Victoria and Albert Museum, Kensington. The attention of the public was called to this by Griffin, *Life*, pp. 58-60, in 1910. Also by Miss M. A. Phillips, in the *Cornhill Magazine* for May 1912; she does not mention Griffin. Her article is referred to by F. G. Kenyon, in the Centenary Edition of the *Works*.

On the flyleaf is written "R Browning October 30th 1833" and on the title-page "To my true friend John Forster." The Rev. W. J. Fox had sent this copy to John Stuart Mill, who wrote many notes on the margins and a long note at the end, because he intended to review the book for *Tait's Edinburgh Magazine*; but the editor declined Mill's article.¹ It was characteristic of Mill to return the volume. Browning answered on the margins in ink many of Mill's puzzled pencilled queries and gave the book to Forster.

This is therefore a first edition, with manuscript notes by Mill and by the author. Miss Phillips is mistaken in saying that some of the MS. notes are by Forster. I made a careful examination, copied them all, and it seemed clear that nothing was written by Forster. In order to be doubly sure, I wrote to Arthur K. Sabin, poet and printer, then Technical Assistant at the Victoria and Albert Museum. He kindly replied as follows on October third, 1912:

I have gone carefully through the "Pauline" once again. The notes are by one consistent hand throughout, and this is not Forster's hand, and the replies to the notes are in each case in Browning's hand. I have sometimes been disposed to doubt the evidence as to Mill having written them; but Forster certainly did not have *any* share in the matter. The writer in the *Cornhill Magazine* is therefore wrong.

Fortunately we can prove Mill's authorship. In the first volume of the first series of the privately printed Letters of Browning, edited by T. J. Wise (1895), page 67, is a letter (to Furnivall):

29 Aug. 1881.

The pencil notes of John Mill which he meant to construct an article

¹ Kenyon says, and Wise implies, that *Tait's* refused Mill's review; Griffin says *The Examiner* refused it.

upon—till he found he had been forestalled by a flippant line in the Review which he was accustomed at that time to write for—are at the end of the copy of *Pauline* in Forster's Library at Kensington. He had never seen me.

Furnivall naturally looked up this copy and it could not be found. The entry had been struck out of the catalogue, possibly because it had been returned to Browning at his request. Browning promised to look for it and on August 8, 1886, wrote to Furnivall:

There was a note of explanation in the copy I gave John Forster—which contained also a criticism by John Mill. It is not included in the Catalogue of his books, however—but may turn up some day.²

Wise adds a footnote: "The book *has* 'turned up' and is now safely deposited in the Dyce and Forster Library, at South Kensington." I learn from *Baylor's Browning Interests* (2 Series, ed. Armstrong, Waco, Texas, 1931), that Forster had loaned the copy to Justice Chitty, who did not return it. He died in 1899, his son found the book and gave it back to the Forster collection in South Kensington.

In the first collected edition of Browning's *Poems* (2 vols., London, 1849), Browning's short preface says:

Many of these pieces were out of print, the rest had been withdrawn from circulation, when the corrected edition, now submitted to the reader, was prepared. The various *Poems* and *Dramas* have received the author's most careful revision.

Pauline was among those "withdrawn from circulation." It was also omitted from the *Poetical Works* (3 vols., London) of 1863. But in the six volume edition of the *Poetical Works*, London, 1868, it appears for the first time since 1833. Browning's well-known preface states:

The first piece in the series, I acknowledge and retain with extreme repugnance, indeed purely of necessity; for not long ago I inspected one, and am certified of the existence of other transcripts, intended sooner or later to be published abroad: by forestalling these, I can at least correct some misprints (no syllable is changed) and introduce a boyish work by an exculpatory word.

Later, in the final edition of 1888, Browning preserved this preface and added another, explaining that finally he had revised the poem.

² Wise's *Second Series*, II, (1908), 32.

The preface to the 1868 edition is dated Dec. 25, 1867. In *MLN.* for June 1909, I pointed out that Browning was mistaken when he said (1867) "no syllable is changed." There were enough changes to make the edition of 1868 a different text from that of 1833. So we have three texts of *Pauline*, 1833, 1868, 1888.

I think I can now satisfactorily answer, though I cannot absolutely prove it, the question "as Browning hated to reprint *Pauline*, why did he do it, and why did he do it in 1867?" His reasons as given in the Preface of that year are vague. Mr. Ansley Newman, a former pupil of mine at Yale, bought in Europe a very important MS. letter of Browning's and sent it to me.

The letter is addressed on the envelope to Richard Herne Shepherd, Esq. 5. Hereford Square, Brompton. S.W. It is all in Browning's handwriting and covers four pages of "mourning" stationery—probably for his father who had died the previous year, 1866.

19, Warwick Crescent,
Upper Westbourne Terrace, W.
Feb. 1. '67.

Dear Sir,

I hardly know what to say in reply to your request: I cannot but have repugnance to any exhibition of a boyish attempt, which never bore my name, and, as yourself remark, from my keeping it out of all collections of my poems these thirty years and more, must have enjoyed my best wishes for its abolition: but nobody cares about an author's feelings in such a matter, and I can hardly do more than make a grimace and submit to whatever mine may have to undergo. I do not wonder that you refused to edit the whole poem for America, though I am obliged greatly by your sense of justice and gentlemanliness as shown by such a refusal; and in consequence I will bring myself to say that—in reliance upon those two qualities—if you will strictly confine yourself to "a few extracts"—and will preface these with mention of the fact that the poem was purely dramatic and intended to head a series of "Men & Women" such as I have afterwards introduced to the world under somewhat better auspices,—mentioning this on your own authority, and not in any way alluding to this of mine—and, further, if you will subject the whole of the extracts to my approval—(not a single remark upon them,—only the passages themselves)—in this case, and not otherwise, I give the leave you desire. I may add that I am glad you do not refer to any early works of my wife: I should be compelled to prevent any extract from them. I am, dear Sir,

Yours Faithfully,

ROBERT BROWNING.

Something happened between February and December, 1867, to cause Browning to publish *Pauline* with a very few changes—evidently he did not have time to revise the poem. It seems to me highly probable that Shepherd's proposal offers the explanation. As a matter of fact, Shepherd never did print the "extracts" he had in mind when he wrote to Browning. Possibly he did not reply to this letter, and Browning became suspicious.

Shepherd's ideas about the rights of authors were hazy. In spite of the clear statement of Browning in this letter saying he "should be compelled to prevent" any publication of extracts from his wife's poetry, Shepherd in 1878 published Mrs. Browning's *Earlier Poems* without the consent of her family, who were very angry. Shepherd was only forty-three when he died in 1895, but he had managed to annoy a good many authors. He edited a large number of uncollected works. In 1875 he printed an edition of fifty copies of some of Tennyson's earlier poems, and the volume was suppressed by order of the court. He got 150 pounds damage out of the staid *Athenaeum* in 1879 for its adverse review of his edition of Lamb's *Poetry for Children*. In 1881, the year of Carlyle's death, he published a biography of him and was forced to cancel some passages. The *DNB.* calls Shepherd a "literary chiffonier." I suspect he was consumed by literary ambition, for he had published a book of original verse at the age of sixteen. Finding he could not write anything important, he became busy as a bibliographer and editor.

Browning seems to have been justified in making precise conditions with Shepherd.

Had Mr. Wallis been aware of the Kensington *Pauline* it would have helped him. He is not sure what the allusion to Shelley, "His award" means. Well, Mill had written "What does this mean? His opinion of yourself? only at the fourth reading of the poem I found out what this meant" and Browning wrote under that, "The award of fame to him, the late acknowledgment of Shelley's genius."

It has often been assumed that if the magazine editor had been willing to print Mill's review, that review would have been favorable; but Mill's long MS. note at the end of the poem hardly

bears that out. Mill had occasionally written "Beautiful" on the margins, but his final note shows that he thought the poem very confused. It is pleasant, however, to see his wish: "A mind in that state can only be regenerated by some new passion, and I know not what to wish him but that he may meet with a *real Pauline*." When Mill returned the book to Fox, he wrote that his pencilled observations were on the whole "not flattering to the author—perhaps too strong in the expression to be shown him."³

An amusing thing in Mill's notes is on page 18, lines 4, 5. "The passages where the meaning is so imperfectly expressed as not to be easily understood, will be marked X." Evidently Mill had got tired of writing queries.

Browning was in a cheerful mood when he annotated Mill's annotations; Mill wrote, "he is always talking of being *prepared*—what for?" Browning wrote, "Why, 'that's tellings,' as school-boys say."

Here are some of Mill's notes:

Line 18, "Nature would point at one" Mill writes, "not I think an appropriate image and it throws considerable obscurity over the meaning of the passage." 36, 37, "Not even poetically grammatical." 112, *And then I was a young witch*. "A curious idealization of self-worship, very fine, though." 147, "A bad simile. the spider does not detest or scorn the light." 164-170, "beautiful". 172-180, "most beautiful". 213-218, "The obscurity of this is the greater fault as the meaning if I can *guess* it right is really poetical". 222-229, "beautiful". 232-235, "beautiful". 260-268, *I strip my mind bare, etc.* "this only says you shall see what you shall see has more prose than poetry". 284, *Which marks me—an imagination which* "not imagination but Imagination the absence of that capital letter obscures the meaning" B. changed it to "I" to conform to Mill, but he left it without the capital in 1868 and in 1888. 342, *tho' those shadowy times were past* "what times? your own imaginative time? or the antique times themselves?" 383, *I had done nothing, so I sought to know* "this writer seems to use 'so' according to the colloquial vulgarism, in the sense of 'therefore' or 'accordingly'—from which occasionally comes great obscurity & ambiguity—as here." 448-490, "This, to page 36, is finely painted, and evidently from experience." 572, *And him sitting alone in blood*, "striking." 622, *is in that power* "you should make clearer *what* power." 637-642, "self-flattery." 646-647, "inconsistent with what precedes." 678-80, "deeply true." 686, *And sympathy obscured by sophistries*, Mill marked X, meaning unintelligible. B. cancelled the line, but kept it in

³ *Baylor's Browning Interests*, 2 Series, p. 45.

the eds. of 1868 and 1888. 689-709, Mill drew a line through the entire paragraph, from *I cherish* to *These are*. 770-778, "good descriptive writing." 811, Mill cancels this line and the entire French note and everything from 812 to 821. Miss Phillips says, "Mill quite overlooks the little note in French." 1029, last 3 lines of poem, "this transition from speaking to Pauline to writing a letter to the public with *place* and *date*, is quite horrible." Mill is mistaken; B. was not addressing Pauline, but Shelley. However, B.'s explanation of "*Richmond. October 22, 1822*" is well known. He first wrote it here, an annotation to Mill's note.

Mill's notes were in pencil, Browning's in ink. Here are Browning's:

36, "comma after But, omit period after thee." 92, "change *that* to *yet*." 171, "change *scarce* to *not*." 284, "make Imagination big I." 314, "italicise myself." 315, "change *For* to *And*." 361, "change *was* to *is*." 388, "change *and* to *at*." 404, "make One capital." 497, "change *as a* to *a mere*." 544, "change *would* to *should*." 548, "put 'to' before *them*." This was done in 1868 as it was an obvious typ. error. Wallis misses this in his reprint of 1833. 686, "strike out" this line. 818, "Elide *that*." This was done in 1868, an obvious error.

At line 567 *king* is explained by B.'s writing in Greek a passage from the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus. At line 569, *him* has Browning's Greek quotation from Sophocles's *Ajax*. At line 573, *boy*. Browning quotes the *Choephoroe* of Aeschylus. It refers to Orestes. At line 964, *The fair*, Browning quotes the *Antigone* of Sophocles.

The fact that although Browning made these notes with the belief that they were improvements, while he adopted hardly any of them in the edition of 1868 and only two or three in 1888, and those only obvious errors that required correction, proves to my mind that when Browning was preparing the edition of 1868 and of 1888, he did not have this annotated copy within reach. In 1881 he knew (by letter previously given in this article) that the volume was still in existence and he thought it was in the Forster and Dyce Library.

I wish I knew exactly when Browning wrote his notes in this volume. Perhaps the long note at the beginning came later than the replies to Mill, which may have been written in 1833, when he got the book back. But his long note, published in full in Griffin (p. 56), could hardly have been written then; he calls *Pauline* an "abortion" and in the well-known last sentence, "Only this crab remains of the shapely Tree of Life in this Fools paradise of mine." Kenyon, in the Centenary Edition (I, p. ix), says it was written

"five years later" than 1832. It is probable that he gave the book to Forster in 1837, in recognition of Forster's help in *Strafford*.⁴

Yale University

WILLIAM LYON PHELPS

COLERIDGE'S "THEORY OF LIFE"

Two fragments of manuscript which I have recently come across in the S. T. Coleridge collections of the British Museum throw some light on the much-discussed posthumous "Hints Towards the Formation of a More Comprehensive Theory of Life."

The first offers corroboration of statements found in manuscript notes left by the poet's daughter Sarah and his grandson Ernest Hartley Coleridge, about the immediate occasion for the composition of the "Theory of Life." These notes were first printed in 1929, and evidently had not been known to students

⁴The Forster and Dyce collection also contains the MSS. of *Paracelsus* and of *Christmas Eve and Easter Day*. The *Paracelsus* MS. is a large quarto. It is beautifully written; a fair copy in large hand, quite unlike the MS. of *Christmas Eve*, which is written in very small characters. The *Paracelsus* MS. was carried to the publishers, while *Christmas Eve* was sent from Italy, and postage was expensive. The *Paracelsus* MS. is written with hardly any corrections or erasures on both sides of sheets, 11 inches by 8½, of thick, rough paper. On first leaf is pasted a big full-length picture of Paracelsus with his long sword, "AZOTH" on the hilt. Browning has written "*Parturiunt madido quo nixu prola, recepta: Sed quo scripta manu sunt—veneranda magis.* To John Forster Esq. (my early Understander) with true thanks for his generous & seasonable public Confession of Faith in me. Hatcham, Surrey, 1842. R. B." Prof. G. L. Hendrickson informs me the Latin should read *prela* for *prola*, and the *quo* in both cases should be *quae*. Thus the Latin phrase is a pleasantry showing how much better is MS. than the printing press. "What the presses spawn with sodden travail is received; but what is written by hand deserves more reverence." Browning could be obscure even in Latin.

Next leaf is "Paracelsus: by Robt. Browning." This is written in an enormous hand. Then follows the Preface "I am anxious," etc. which appeared in the first edition, and was afterwards omitted. The preface is dated in the MS. "15. March 1835." At the end of Part III another picture of P. is pasted in, and at end of Part IV still another.

Christmas Eve, stanzas XII, XIII, XIV, through the line "The hawk-nosed, high-cheek-boned Professor," are in Mrs. Browning's hand, as are also stanza XVI, from the line "But if the common conscience must" through the line "And from man's dust to God's divinity?" and stanza XXII, from the line "In short, a spectator might have fancied" to the end.

of the treatise at the time Joseph Needham published his interesting article, "Coleridge as a Philosophical Biologist," in *SP.*, April, 1926. Sarah Coleridge in her note spoke of the essay as "an offset" of a treatise on scrofula, and E. H. Coleridge stated that it "was intended to form part of an Essay on Scrofula which was begun by James Gillman Senior," the physician with whom Coleridge spent the last years of his life.¹

Those familiar with the use Coleridge makes of the laws of "productivity," "irritability," and "sensibility" in his "Theory of Life" will easily find in the fragment evidence of a close relationship between that treatise and some work on the disease of scrofula; they will also find it indicative of Coleridge's habitual method of linking his most abstruse metaphysical speculations with practical problems of applied science. The fragment, f. 160 of Egerton MSS. 2800, is in Coleridge's own hand, and reads as follows:

the higher Analysis. These are now confirmations of the Theory; but what if they had been allowed to occasion it's rejection? . . . Thus it is most true that Scrofula is not confined to any one class of complexions, and characters of constitutional tendency. But it is likewise true, that the complexion itself, in the widest acceptation of the word, is tho' a frequent yet far from being a constant exponent of constitutional character. Still however it is fact, that in this country and generally throughout the North of Europe the Males, that are, or are most likely under exciting causes to become the subjects of Scrofula, are distinguished by a certain *speciousness* of color, and apparent laxity of fibre, large or full eyes, and a certain feminine character of quick feeling, ready sympathy, lively fancy, and other marks of venous predominance. [An asterisk follows, indicating probably that some lost fragment was to be inserted in place of a deleted clause—"Distinguishing the Powers of Life into it's three dimensions corresponding to Length, Superficies, and Depth," and then the argument continues with the following tables:]

	1	2	3
As thus:	Reproduction	Irritability	Sensibility
	Reproduction	Irritability	Sensibility
	Irritability	Reproduction	Irritability
	Sensibility	Sensibility	Reproduction

It is to be noted that the figure 3 is underscored, showing that the third table, in which sensibility predominates, is meant to characterize individuals of scrofulous tendencies. There is no more

¹ See my study, *Coleridge on Logic and Learning, with Selections from the Unpublished Manuscripts*, 16, 17.

to the fragment except an isolated note on the reverse side of the page, an insert, though not that referred to by the asterisk mentioned above.

Insert

In like manner, of the Textures, that comprise the Apple of the Eye, each may be influenced without &c.

The second fragment, found among those catalogued as "Notes and fragments on the doctrine of opposites, or polarity, in metaphysics, logic, theology, etc.," Egerton MSS. 2801 ff. 121 ff., is very similar to the argument in the "Theory of Life," pp. 50 ff. It is, however, a much more concise and definite attempt—in fact, barring the fact that it breaks off at a crucial point, it is the best attempt of Coleridge's that I know—to relate the two most fundamental principles of his philosophical thought: the principle of organic development and that of polarity or the reconciliation of opposites. As such it may be of incidental use to students who are still working on Coleridge's relations to Schelling and the German Natur-philosophen.

In the inorganic world the constituent antagonist powers meet only to destroy each other, and in the instant of their mutual Intersusception lose themselves in the common Product: while, on the other hand, the self-same instant, that the *Productivities* are liberated, and with the recommencing of *their* Conflict, the *Product* ceases to exist. Instance, Water = Oxygen + Hydrogen, as the chemical Representatives of the Electrical, or E. and W., Poles.—The continuance therefore of the productive Power as Power in the Product *as* Product constitutes Organization. Hence it would be difficult to recall any true Thesis and Antithesis, of which a living organ is not the Synthesis or rather the Indifference—difficult to imagine any true Opposites, which are not balanced against each other in the living organism. Rest in Motion, Sameness in change, Unity in Multiplicity—&c; or Hardness with Softness, Solidity with Capacity, the semi-fluid with the semi-rigid—and in like manner of all the component forms of organization itself as fibre, vein, artery, &c.

Now this "wonderful & fearful making" is possible under one condition only—viz. that the product is never compleated, but always

This fragment, like the first, is in Coleridge's own hand, and it is marked by a symbol used by Coleridge to indicate insertion in some work. What more probable than that it is a part of some draft of the "Theory of Life," discarded, like many such manuscript fragments, by Coleridge himself, or a copyist or editor?

ON THE REVISIONS OF *HYPERION*

Recent criticism on the date of the two *Hyperions*, evoked by Amy Lowell's contention that the *Fall of Hyperion* was the earlier version of *Hyperion* itself, is restricted to a discussion of the external evidence. Sidney Colvin, who in 1887¹ first proved that *Hyperion* was the earlier poem, argued the question also from the standpoint of the internal evidence, offered by the Woodhouse MS. of *Hyperion*, the only MS. at the time available.

The most convincing part of Colvin's argument concerns the lines which are corrected in the MS. by the hand either of Keats, Taylor, or Woodhouse. These lines appear again in the *Fall of Hyperion* in precisely this revised form. Colvin's argument is weak, however, because it rests really on only three² instances. One immediately asks if Keats might not have reverted in these cases to the earlier form of the line. As a matter of fact, Keats did in a few instances revert to earlier readings when composing the *Fall of Hyperion*. The most striking of these cases is afforded by line 199.³ In the holograph of *Hyperion* this first appears

Who on a wide plain gather in sad troops

but is revised to read

Who on wide plains gather in panting troops;

in the *Fall of Hyperion* it appears in its earlier form,

Who on a wide plain gather in sad troops.

Is not more convincing internal evidence offered by the holograph itself? Here are to be found thirty⁴ lines whose corrections evince definite gains in poetic excellence—lines which appear

¹ Colvin, *Keats* (English Men of Letters Series), 1887, pp. 226-228.

² Lines 76, 189, 200.

³ Other instances appear in lines 81, 190.

⁴ Lines 3, 18, 19, 20, 21, 48, 62, 76, 78, 90, 91, 108, 112, 128, 173, 175, 178, 181, 190, 191, 192, 193, 196, 198, 199, 203, 214, 217, 218, 219. The more important of these corrections are given by de Selincourt in the notes to his edition of Keats. A complete discussion of the revisions of the *Hyperion* as well as a facsimile of the holograph is to be found in *Hyperion, A Facsimile of Keats's Autograph Manuscript*, ed. E. de Selincourt, Oxford, 1905.

in exactly this corrected and perfected form in the *Fall of Hyperion*. An instance afforded by ll. 18-19 will suffice to illustrate the point. Keats first wrote:

His old right hand lay nerveless on the ground,
Unseptred; and his white brow'd eyes were clos'd;

"on the ground" was first replaced by "dead or supine," which in turn was replaced by "listless, dead." "White brow'd" was first changed to "ancient" and later to "realmless." In the *Fall of Hyperion* the lines appear in just this final form:

His old right hand lay nerveless, listless, dead,
Unseptred, and his realmless eyes were closed.

ADELE B. BALLMAN

Baltimore

THE AUTHENTICITY OF BURNS' "WHEN FIRST I SAW FAIR JEANIE'S FACE"

There has always been some doubt concerning Burns' authorship of the posthumous song, "When First I Saw Fair Jeanie's Face." Some authorities deem it so poor that they class it among the "Improbables." Burns editors all agree that its first printing occurred in the *New York Mirror*, for Saturday, November 22, 1846. Those who accept the song include: Henley and Henderson (Centenary Edition), G. A. Aitkin (Aldine), and J. L. Robertson. They do so on the statement of Chambers, to the effect that Alexander Smith collated it with a copy in the poet's handwriting in his 1868 edition of Burns' works. Those who reject the song are: J. C. Dick, William Allan Neilson, and W. Wallace. The last mentioned does not include it in his re-editing of Chambers' work.

Seemingly unknown to the many Burns editors, this song was actually first printed in the *Analectic Magazine*, for September, 1813, with this notation: We have been favored with the following song in manuscript. It is from the pen of Robert Burns, and has never before been published.

At the time when this song was printed in the *Analectic Magazine*, Washington Irving was the anonymous editor. This circum-

stance is verified by David J. Hill, Charles Dudley Warner, George S. Hellman, and William Morton Payne. R. Farquharson Sharp, in his *Dictionary of English Authors*, lists him as Associate Editor. Moses Thomas' magazine was called *The Select Review*, until Irving became associated with it, when it became known as the *Analectic Magazine*. It was a short-lived publication. Irving, during the two years or less of his editorship, wrote several articles for it. Among them were a number of short bibliographies of famous naval men.

The song, "When First I Saw Fair Jeanie's Face," was addressed by Burns to Jane Jefferies, who became Mrs. William Renwick. This woman was, later in her life, a friend of Washington Irving, according to Charles Dudley Warner and George S. Hellman. Further proof of the friendship is found in the letter which Irving wrote to Mrs. Renwick, and which has been printed for private distribution in the collection compiled by her great-grand-daughter, Agnes Adams, of Wall Vicarage, Lichfield, England. The fact that Irving traveled through Wales with James Renwick, the son of "Fair Jeanie," is further proof of his friendship with the family. George S. Hellman goes so far as to claim that Irving was at one time in love with this widow, who was nine years older than himself. It is significant that Hellman quotes this very song in his "Washington Irving, Esquire," as evidence that the woman who took Irving's fancy had once been thought attractive by Burns.

These two men were evidently connected in their interest in Mrs. Renwick. What more likely than that she gave her young editor-admirer the song that her dead friend had written about her, years before, with permission to use it in his *Analectic Magazine*? This assumption seems to strengthen the probability of Burns' authorship.

The earlier printing does not vary greatly from the *New York Mirror* edition, except for the use of 'Nith' in place of 'Forth,' in the sixth line of the last verse. The *Analectic* version of the song is as follows:

When first I saw my Jeany's face
 I coud na' think what ail'd me,
 My heart gaed fluttering, pit a pat,
 My een had nearly fail'd me.
 She's ay sae neat, sae trim and tight,
 Ilk grace does round her hover;
 Ae look depriv'd me o' my heart,
 And I became her lover.

She's ay ay sae blythe and gay,
 She's ay sae blythe and chearie,
 She's ay sae bonnie, blythe and gay;
 O gin I were her dearie!

Had I Dundas's whole estate,
 Or Hopeton's pride to shine in,
 Did warlike laurels crown my fate,
 Or softer bays entwining;
 I'd lay them all at Jeany's feet
 Could I but hope to move her,
 And prouder than a peer or knight,
 I'd be my Jeany's lover.

She's ay ay, &c.

But sair I doubt some happier swain
 Has gain'd my Jeany's favour,
 If sae, may every bliss be her's,
 Though I can never have her.
 But gang she east, or gang she west,
 'Twixt Nith and Tweed all over,
 While men have eyes, or ears, or taste,
 She'll always find a lover.

She's ay ay, &c.

The traditional version of the song as given in the *New York Mirror* may be found in the following compilations: Henley and Henderson (1897), vol. 4, page 32; Globe Edition (London 1900), edited by Alexander Smith, page 278; Cambridge Edition (Houghton Mifflin 1897), page 311; and John Dicks (London 1868), page 129.

ESTHER C. AVERILL

Worcester, Massachusetts

AN INTERPRETATION OF BLAKE'S *A DIVINE IMAGE*

In *William Blake: His Philosophy and Symbols*,¹ Mr. Damon writes thus:

A Divine Image is a picture of the God of this World, Urizen. It reveals Satan as he appears in human form.—Stanza 1. Cruelty, Jealousy, Terror, and Secrecy are human qualities, just as much as Kindness, Generosity, Love, Confidence; therefore a god can be erected out of them.

¹ *William Blake: His Philosophy and Symbols*, Boston and New York, 1924, pp. 283-284.

Stanza 2. As a result, the "human dress" or the flesh becomes the "forged iron" of a prison to the soul; the inner form is itself a creator of other forms equally materialistic (since everything is created by the mind); the face conceals its hot passions; and the heart expresses them.

As an interpretation this is vague and, indeed, the meaning is less apparent here than in the original poem. The commentator is searching far for the explanation and is using materialism not to clear up but to becloud the situation.

The poem is, obviously, a "companion poem to 'The Divine Image,'" ² in *Songs of Innocence*. With that in mind we may quote the poem, linking the lines on the same subjects in this song of Experience and joining these lines to the contrasted keywords in the earlier poem.

A Divine Image

Cruelty has a human heart,
And Jealousy a human face;
Terror the human form divine,
And Secrecy the human dress.

The human dress is forged iron,
The human form a fiery forge,
The human face a furnace seal'd,
The human heart its hungry gorge.

From *The Divine Image*

For Mercy has a human heart, _____ 4 Cruelty knows no Mercy
Pity a human face, _____ 3 Jealousy supplants Pity
And Love, the human form divine, _____ 2 Terror displaces Love
And Peace, the human dress. _____ 1 Secrecy ruins Peace

On the basis of these groupings we may interpret the poem thus.

1. "The human dress is forged iron"—that is, man is willing to clothe himself in *Secrecy* which ruins *Peace*; for is not the secrecy of the cabal, of misunderstanding, or of hypocrisy the cause of war? Thus he forges iron for the conflict and makes himself iron-clad and ready to do battle.

2. "The human form [is] a fiery forge"—that is, man is a "forge" burning with plans for torturing others and brooding over ways of creating *Terror*. Man is no longer controlled by *Love*; he is a forge glowing with *Terror*.

² *Poetical Works of William Blake*, ed. John Sampson, London, 1928 (Oxford Edition), p. 106.

3. "The human face [is] a seal'd furnace"—that is, man's face is a "furnace" full of "hot passions" (as Mr. Damon suggests); but *Jealousy* has sealed that face. Fear of others and of change has cooled over the furnace which no longer has any place for new feelings. Thus sealed over, the furnace glows on as it is because it lacks *Pity*, which would destroy Jealousy and unseal the face. Doubtless Blake would say Reason was responsible for this cooling process.

4. "The human heart [is] its hungry gorge"—that is, the heart of man is a sort of *cruel*, unglutted gullet which is ever-eager to swallow all vicious food. It knows no *Mercy* and circulates its *Cruelty* in various forms such as actions, thoughts, and deeds throughout the whole body or "forge", furnishing the raw materials for all the parts.

Thus the whole poem is seen to be a direct contrast to the humanitarian idealism of the earlier poem, "The Divine Image." Here man is in the perverted or satanic form that he assumes under the dominance of the God of this World, Urizen or Reason or Materialism; man is in the shape that Experience gives him. In the companion poem man is in the true or divine form which is molded in the image of God; man is in the shape that Innocence bestows upon him. Moreover, this meaning may be applied to the individual as well as to man in general.

Frequently writers have employed the symbol of iron dress for man's life on earth, thus agreeing with the disillusioned mood of "A Divine Image." The defiance which Experience had taught Melville's *Pierre* is couched in Blake's own terms. "Stemming such tempests through the deserted streets, Pierre felt a dark, triumphant joy; that while others had crawled in fear to their kennels, he alone defied the storm-admiral, whose most vindictive peltings of hailstones,—striking his *iron-framed fiery furnace of a body*,—melted into soft dew, and so, harmlessly trickled from off him."³

Still it is necessary not to forget that writers, of however deep insight, usually stop at this knowledge taught by the world, and that the poem under discussion is but a phase in Blake's development, in the scale of his mystical values. The ideals of "The Divine Image," he is convinced, shall ultimately overthrow the

³ *Pierre*, New York, 1930 (Americana Deserta Edition), p. 378.

wordly reason of "A Divine Image"; then man shall be characterized by Mercy, Pity, Love, and Peace rather than by Secrecy, Jealousy, Terror, and Cruelty.

STEPHEN A. LARRABEE

Purdue University

ADDITIONS TO THE BIBLIOGRAPHY OF W. S. GILBERT'S CONTRIBUTIONS TO MAGAZINES

Although discussions of the work of W. S. Gilbert are nearly legion, Townley Searle's *Bibliography of Sir William Schwenck Gilbert* (London: 30 Gerard Street, 1931) is the first serious attempt to establish an extended list of his writings in magazines and for the theatre. In his anomalous *Story of Gilbert and Sullivan: The 'Compleat' Savoyard* (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1928), Isaac Goldberg noted the need of a complete bibliography and announced that he had the materials for one. But before the appearance of Mr. Searle's work, the existence of many a Gilbertian item was known only through casual references in Mr. Goldberg's book, in *W. S. Gilbert: His Life and Letters* by Sidney Dark and Rowland Grey (London: Methuen, 1923), in S. J. Adair Fitzgerald's *The Story of the Savoy Opera in Gilbert and Sullivan Days* (New York: Appleton, 1922), and in perhaps a few other sources, including the manuscript Master's dissertation of Elizabeth Long, *Sir W. S. Gilbert: The Savoy Operas in Relation to their Time* (Columbia University Library), which contains a list of Gilbert's plays inclusive of a few items not in the *DNB*. Although his work is incomplete and abounds in errors, Mr. Searle adds many an item to the list provided by these writers; and in discussing first editions of plays and operas, he opens an entirely new field.

Reviewers have recently commented at some length upon Mr. Searle's handling of Gilbert's dramatic works. The selections of "Books about W. S. Gilbert" and of "Fugitive Contributions about W. S. Gilbert" is eccentric; but the two lists, after all, contain nearly everything of importance—Gilbertian scholarship is not yet far beyond the chatty point. Gilbert's "Contributions to Magazines, Annuals, &c." remains for discussion.

It is notable that the "Valuable Baby" of p. 88 in Mr. Searle's bibliography was really the "Variable Baby" of p. 76 (so in *Fun*,

9 Oct., 1969, p. 51, and as reprinted correctly by Mr. Goldberg, p. 552); similarly that "Blubworth-cum-Tarkington" of p. 75 was really "Blabworth-cum-Talkington" of p. 87 (*Fun*, 20 June, 1868, p. 153; Goldberg, p. 535); that Gentle Archibald's name was not "Melloy" (p. 75), but "Molloy" (*Fun*, 19 May, 1866, p. 100); that "A. and B., or The Sensational Twins" was published in *Fun* (2 Nov., 1867, p. 77), not in *Punch* of the same date as Mr. Goldberg implies (pp. 531, 534) and Mr. Searle avers it was (p. 75); and that the illustrations to "King Borria Bungalee Boo" (*Fun*, 7 July, 1866) were not the first Gilbertian drawings signed "Bab" inasmuch as there was a drawing signed "Bab" in *Fun* for 9 Nov., 1861 (p. 77) and "The Story of Gentle Archibald" (*Fun*, 19 May, 1866, p. 100) and "Only a Dancing Girl" (*Fun*, 23 June, 1866, p. 146) were Babs illustrated by "Bab." It is certainly misleading to say with Mr. Searle (p. 87) that "General John" (*Fun*, 1 June, 1867) was the first ballad written by Gilbert, for he would be a bold man who would define a "Bab ballad." At least eight poems written before "General John" were included in the collected *Bab Ballads*; "Bab" illustrated four poems before he illustrated "General John"; and "The Yarn of the 'Nancy Bell'" (*Fun*, 3 March, 1866) was in the ballad metre of "General John." It is true therefore only that "General John" was the first Gilbertian poem in ballad metre to be illustrated by "Bab" for *Fun* and included in *Bab Ballads*. It is similarly misleading to say with Mr. Searle (p. 87) that W. S. G. "commenced writing 'Dramatic Notices'" for *Fun* on 15 Sept., 1866. Gilbert was the author of "At the Play" (*Fun*, 16 Jan., 23 July, 1864), "Procession of Pantomime" (16 Jan., 1864), "On the Pantomimic Unities" (20 Feb., 26 Mar., 1864). And "From our Stall," a series of dramatic notices extending to 7 March, 1868, began in *Fun* on 20 May, 1865—Messrs. Dark and Grey, who had access to a "marked" copy of *Fun*, quote (p. 15) from these notices as Gilbert's for May, 1865.

Mr. Searle prints (pp. 75-6) a list of eighteen "lost" or uncollected Babs, including at least two—"The Dream" and "To my Absent Husband"—which are not, properly speaking, Babs, since neither was illustrated by "Bab" or included in *Bab Ballads*. All of these eighteen poems have been reprinted by Mr. Goldberg (pp. 96-7, 529-558) or by Messrs. Dark and Grey (pp. 241-260). The list omits mention of the following "lost" or un-

collected poems illustrated by "Bab" in magazines: "Croquet: An Anticipation" (*Fun*, 2 May, 1867, p. 77); "Sir Galahad the Golumptious" (*Fun*, 15 June, 1867, p. 149); "Boulogne" (*Fun*, 12 Sept., 1868, p. 7; Mr. Searle, however, lists this occasional poem on p. 87); "The Wise Policeman" (*Fun*, 22 Oct., 1870, p. 156); and "Drop of Pantomime Water" (*The Graphic*, Xmas No., 1870). Mr. Searle's list also omits mention of other uncollected poems by Gilbert, including "Young May Moon" (*Fun*, 6 June, 1863, p. 118); "Sixty-three and Sixty-four" (*Fun*, 2 Jan., 1864, p. 162); "The Baron Klopffzetterheim; or The Beautiful Bertha and the Big Bad Brothers of Bonn," in 5 fyttes (*Fun*, 19, 26 Mar., 2, 9, 16 April, 1864, pp. 8, 18, 21, 38, 48); "Down to the Derby with Rhymes on the Road" (*Fun*, 28 May, 1864, p. 110); and "Musings in a Music Hall" (*Fun*, 28 Oct., 1865, p. 69).

Mr. Searle's list (pp. 86-8) of the original magazine-publications of those Babs which were later included in *Bab Ballads* or *More Bab Ballads* is so incomplete that the simplest way to reconstruct it is to give the entire series in chronological order. I must confess that I have never come across two of these Babs—"To a Little Maid" and "Tempora Mutantur"—in *Fun*, though they were probably published there. In the following list, those Babs marked with an asterisk are noted by Mr. Searle; the "lost" Babs are listed sequentially in footnotes. Unless specified otherwise, all are from *Fun*.

I. The *Bab Ballads* group, first collected in 1869:

1. To a Little Maid
2. Tempora Mutantur

1865

3. To Phoebe, 20 Aug.
4. To the Terrestrial Globe, 30 Sept.

1866

- 5.*The Phantom Curate, 6 Jan.
6. Ferdinando and Elvira, 17 Feb.
7. The Pantomine "Super" to his Mask, 24 Feb.
8. The Yarn of the 'Nancy Bell,' 3 March
9. Haunted, 24 March
10. To my Bride, 9 June

Illustrated by "Bab"¹

¹ Illustrated by "Bab," "The Story of Gentle Archibald" was published 18 May, 1866; republished by Grey-Dark, p. 254.

1866

11. Only a Dancing Girl, 23 June
- 12.*King Borria Bungalee Boo, 7 July²

1867

- 13.*General John, 1 June
14. Sir Guy the Crusader, 8 June³
15. Disillusioned, 6 July
16. John and Freddy, 3 Aug.
17. Lorenzo de Lardy, 10 Aug.
18. The Bishop and the 'Busman, 17 Aug.
19. Babette's Love, 24 Aug.⁴
20. Sir Macklin, 14 Sept.
21. The Troubadour, 21 Sept.
22. Ben Allah Achmet, 28 Sept.
23. The Folly of Brown, 5 Oct.
24. Joe Golightly, 12 Oct.
25. The Rival Curates, 19 Oct.
26. Thomas Winterbottom Hance, 26 Oct.⁵
27. The Bishop of Rum-ti-Foo, 16 Nov.
28. The Precocious Baby, 23 Nov.
29. Baines Carew, Gentleman, 30 Nov.
30. A Discontented Sugar Broker, 14 Dec.
31. Force of Argument, 21 Dec.
32. At a Pantomime, 28 Dec.

1868

- 33.*The Three Kings of Chickeraboo, 18 Jan.
- 34.*The Periwinkle Girl, 1 Feb.
- 35.*Captain Reece, 8 Feb.
- 36.*Thomas Green and Harriet Hale, 15 Feb.
37. Bob Polter, 29 Feb.
- 38.*The Ghost, the Gallant, the Gael, and the Goblin,
14 March
- 39.*Ellen M'Jones Aberdeen, 21 March
- 40.*The Sensation Captain, 4 April⁶
- 41.*The Reverend Micah Sows, 18 April
- 42.*Peter the Wag, 25 April
- 43.*The Story of Prince Agib, 16 May
- 44.*Gentle Alice Brown, 23 May

² "Croquet: An Anticipation" was published 4 May, 1867.

³ "Sir Galahad the Golumptious" was published 15 June, 1867.

⁴ "Fanny and Jenny" was published 7 Sept., 1867; republished by Grey-Dark, p. 245.

⁵ "A. and B." was published 2 Nov., 1867; republished by Goldberg, p. 531.

⁶ "Trial by Jury," originally a Bab, was published 11 April, 1868; republished by Goldberg, p. 164; listed by Searle, p. 35.

II. The *More Bab Ballads* group, first collected in 1873:

1868

1. Pasha Bailey Ben, 6 June ⁷
- 2.*The Sailor Boy to his Lass, 27 June ⁸
3. The Cunning Woman, 25 July
- 4.*The Modest Couple, 8 Aug.⁹
5. Sir Barnaby Bampton Boo, 29 Aug.¹⁰
- 6.*Brave Alum Bey, 19 Sept.
- 7.*Gregory Parable, LL.D., 3 Oct.
8. Lieutenant-Colonel Flare, 10 Oct.¹¹
- 9.*Annie Protheroe, 24 Oct.
10. The Captain and the Mermaids, 7 Nov.
- 11.*An Unfortunate Likeness, 14 Nov.
- 12.*Lost Mr. Blake, 28 Nov.
- 13.*Little Oliver, 5 Dec.¹²

1869

14. The Baby's Vengeance, 16 Jan.
- 15.*The Two Ogres, 23 Jan.
16. Mister William, No. 60, 6 Feb.¹³
17. The Martinet, No. 61, 13 Feb.
18. The King of Canoodle-dum, No. 62, 20 Feb.
19. First Love, No. 63, 27 Feb.
20. The Haughty Actor, No. 64, 27 March
21. The Two Majors, No. 65, 3 April ¹⁴
22. The Bishop of Rum-ti-Foo Again, No. 68, 8 May
23. A Worm will Turn, No. 69, 15 May
24. The Mystic Selvagee, No. 70, 22 May

⁷ "Blabworth-cum-Talkington" was published 20 June, 1868; republished by Goldberg, p. 535.

⁸ "Sir Conrad and the Rusty One" was published 4 July, 1868; republished by Grey-Dark, p. 247.

⁹ "The Bandoline Player" was published 22 Aug., 1868; republished by Grey-Dark, p. 251.

¹⁰ "Boulogne" was published 12 Sept., 1868.

¹¹ "The Hermit" was published 17 Oct., 1868; republished by Goldberg, p. 537.

¹² "The Phantom Head" was published 19 Dec., 1868; republished by Goldberg, p. 540; "Woman's Gratitude" was published 9 Jan., 1869; republished by Goldberg, p. 544.

¹³ With "Mister William," Gilbert began numbering his illustrated poems in *Fun*. The first number is "60"!

¹⁴ "The Three Bohemian Ones," No. 66, was published 10 April, 1869; republished by Grey-Dark, p. 258. "The Policeman's Beard," No. 67, was published 1 May, 1869; republished by Goldberg, p. 548.

- 25. Emily, John, James, and I, No. 71, 29 May ¹⁵
- 26.*The Way of Wooing, No. 73, 11 Sept.¹⁶
- 27.*Hongree and Mahry, No. 77, 10 Nov.
- 28. Etiquette, *The Graphic*, Xmas No., 1869

1870

- 29.*The Reverend Simon Magus, No. 78, *Fun*, 5 Feb.
- 30.*My Dream, No. 79, 19 March
- 31.*Damon v. Pythias, No. 80, 26 March
- 32.*The Bumboat Woman's Story, No. 81, 2 April
- 33. The Fairy Curate, No. 82, 23 July
- 34. Phrenology, No. 83, 6 Aug.
- 35. The Perils of Invisibility, No. 84, 20 Aug.¹⁷

1871

- 36. Old Paul and Old Tim, No. 85, 28 Jan.

Other notable omissions in Mr. Searle's list of Gilbert's publications in magazines are "Gossip of the Week" (*Fun*, 24, 31, Oct., 7, 14, 21, 28 Nov., 12, 19 Dec., 1863, pp. 53, 63, 73, 89, 99, 108, 129 138), which anticipates the "spur of a moment" joke of *Yeoman of the Guard*, and several short stories: "The Duke's Surprise," discovered by Mr. Goldberg (p. 422) in *Blackwood's*; "Finger of Fate," *Every Saturday* (XL, 562); "An Elixir of Love," *The Graphic* (Xmas No., 1876; see Mr. Searle, p. 40); "Little Mim," *The Graphic* (Xmas No., 1876); and "The Story of a Twelfth Cake," *The Graphic* (Xmas No., 1874). Without explaining what they are, Mr. Searle lists a few skits illustrated by "Bab" in *Fun*. These belong to a series of page-burlesques of contemporary plays, most of which were certainly written by Gilbert, though he illustrated but a few of them. They may prove

¹⁵ "The Ghost of his Ladye Love" was published 14 Aug., 1869; republished by Goldberg, p. 96. It is unnumbered in *Fun*, coming between Nos. 71 and 72, and is not, properly speaking, a Bab. "Prince Il Baleine," No. 72, was published 28 Aug., 1869; republished by Grey-Dark, p. 241.

¹⁶ "The Scornful Colonel," No. 74, was published 25 Sept., 1869; republished by Goldberg, p. 549. "The Variable Baby," No. 75, was published 9 Oct., 1869; republished by Goldberg, p. 552. "The Ladies of the Lea," No. 76, was published 30 Oct., 1869; republished by Goldberg, p. 555.

¹⁷ "The Wise Policeman," No. 85, was published in *Fun*, 22 Oct., 1870, p. 156. "A Drop of Pantomime Water" was published in *The Graphic*, Xmas. No., 1870. The latter, like "Etiquette," was naturally not numbered. It will be noted that there are two No. 85's.

valuable some day in a study of Gilbert's "Dramatic Opinions." One of the most interesting of them is a burlesque—"An Old Score" (*Fun*, 7 Aug. 1869, p. 225)—of Gilbert's own *An Old Score*.

ARTHUR E. DUBOIS

Baltimore, Maryland

WALT WHITMAN AND NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE

It is already known that Walt Whitman thought highly of the *Twice Told Tales*. For he wrote in an editorial on "*Home Literature*" which appeared in *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle* for July 10, 1846:

... Let those who read (and in this country who does not read?) no more condescend to patronize an inferior foreign author, when they have so many respectable writers at home. Shall Hawthorne get a paltry *seventy-five dollars* for a two volume work¹—shall real American genius shiver with neglect—while the public run after this foreign trash? We hope, and we confidently expect, that the people of this land will come to their "sober second thought" upon the subject, and that soon.

The above statement is not the only indication Whitman appreciated *Twice Told Tales*. He reprinted "Old Esther Dudley" in *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle* for July 28 and 29, and inserted "The Shaker Burial" on October 8, 1846.

Nor is this all that Walt Whitman had to say about Hawthorne and his literary work. On April 6, 1846, Whitman wrote the following hitherto unreprinted editorial for *The Brooklyn Daily Eagle*:

GOVERNMENT PATRONAGE OF MEN OF LETTERS

WELL DONE.—In the last list of appointments confirmed by the Senate, published in the *Union*, thousands of readers will notice with peculiar gratification that of HAWTHORNE—the gentle Hawthorne—as Surveyor of the port of Salem, Mass. It is a credit of which any administration may be proud, to have the opportunity of thus conferring a portion of its official patronage upon such recipients. The Author of "*Twice Told*

¹ Whitman refers here to the second edition of *Twice Told Tales* published in 1842. The first edition of 1837 was a single volume. Hawthorne, it seems, kept no account of profits received from the sales of these books. For remarks concerning financial arrangements with his publisher for the first edition, see Horatio Bridge, *Personal Recollections of Nathaniel Hawthorne*, New York, 1893, pp. 79-81.

Tales," the Elia of our country returns more honor than he receives, in his acceptance of such a favor. This is the only mode in which our system of government permits the patronage of literature and men of letters, and we only regret that where it can be done with due regard still had to political character, it is not more often resorted to for that purpose. Hawthorne is and has always been a Democrat, while never engaged in active politics; so that we have his name too, one of the brightest in the young annals of our national literature, to grace the party which notwithstanding Whig pretensions to all the talents and all the education, has already numbered in its ranks the first Poet, the first Historian, the first Novelist, and the first Tragedian, our country has produced.² How do the Whigs explain this "singular coincidence [*sic*]"—*News, this morning.*³

Most heartily do we respond th [*sic*] sentiment of pleasure which our contemporary feels at this appointment! Though we do not know Hawthorne personally, yet we know him in some sort, and take it upon us to say that he will perform the duties of his office, whatever they may be, in an efficient manner, and to answer all the requirements of propriety.—But the recognizing of the principle, is the thing—the principle that literary men are prominently eligible to civil appointments. In this case it has been applied strongly; for Hawthorne is a quiet shrinking person, and little fitted to make his way through the blustering crowd. We hope the government will act upon the same principles again and again, until it gets to be fixed as one of the settled rules for its action.

"But," says one, "why have mere writers any higher claims for such favor, than those of other professions?"

For the following reasons: Literary men of the highest grade, (particularly those who are guided altogether by their ideas of right, and scorn to bend the knee "that thrift may follow fawning")⁴ in a large majority of cases are wretchedly poor, and though fame sometimes comes, yet profit rarely does. They serve the world, as it were, without fee and without reward—for there is no higher and more useful service to humanity, than that of boldly advocating great truths, or elevating intellectual taste. What office, what money, what gift in the power of government, could have compensated Channing for the great anchor he has built for mental independence in America? What pay *could* pay Bryant for those words of glory and truth, richly ushered as the old English language can parallel? What sum in the treasury might balance the account America never has settled with Fulton? And there are now dozens of struggling literary men—not Channings, of course, or Bryants, or Fultons—but with ardent and truthful minds, who have a far closer claim on the government for nomination to office, than all the political demagogues and fishers that ever

² Bryant, Prescott, Cooper, and Forrest.

³ Whitman reprinted all of this editorial from *The New York Morning News*, Monday, April 6, 1846, p. 2, where it is headed "Well Done." In copying the article Whitman omitted the comma after "country" and the question mark after "'coincidence.'"

⁴ *Hamlet*, III, ii, 65.

existed! Such men, *the country is indebted to*. We talk about a gift from a rich millionaire, to some benevolent institution—a granting one hundred or five hundred dollars—as though humanity were bound in everlasting gratitude to such a philanthropist; but what is equal to the far spread and deeply penetrating influence of intellect, coined in images of beauty or truth, and diffused among all the pe[o]ple, to be incorporated in their characters, and to elevate and improve them, and increase their means of pure enjoyment?

We wish the writers of America, through their various avenues of utterance, would dwell oftener and more pointedly on this theme. Daily and hourly we are working—some of us spending health and life itself in the labor—for the cause of mere politicians, of men who make a *trade* of what in its purity is, or ought to be, nobler than any of the other professions. Though much of this is necessary and unavoidable—and though a very large portion of political candidates are men who may be worked for, and spoken for, with a hearty good will, by the truest writer—yet it were not amiss, and the immense demands of the state for servants and service, to remember, also, those who have as honest a right to her smile as any else!

In all probability Hawthorne never saw this editorial, written by a young editor who was to become famous. There is not, moreover, a single reference to Whitman or to *Leaves of Grass* in the letters or literary work of Nathaniel Hawthorne.

T. A. ZUNDER

Brooklyn College

WHITMAN ON ARNOLD: AN UNCOLLECTED COMMENT

From the early days in Washington, following Whitman's dismissal from his clerkship in the Department of the Interior by James Harlan, Arnold had not been in sympathy with Whitman's poetical endeavors. He wrote (1866) in reply to O'Connor's fiery letter (sent to many persons whose influence he wished to enlist upon Whitman's side): "As to the general question of Mr. Walt Whitman's poetical achievements, you will think it savours of our decrepit old Europe when I add that while you think it is his highest merit that he is so unlike anyone else, to me this seems to be his demerit; no one can afford in literature to trade merely on his own bottom and to take no account of what other ages and other nations have acquired."¹ Yet, if Whitman had read and remembered this

¹ Perry, Bliss, *Walt Whitman*, 178.

letter, it did not prejudice him: "I have tried to be just with Arnold: have taken up his books over and over again, hoping I would at last get at the heart of him—have given him every sort of chance to convince me—taking him up in different moods, thinking it might possibly be the mood that prejudiced me. The result was always the same: I was not interested: I was wearied."²

When the news of Arnold's death reached America, on April 16, 1888, the *New York Herald* wired for some comment. Contrary to Whitman's usual leisurely practice, he finished and dispatched that very day the following appraisal, which has apparently never been reprinted:

No doubt a character like Arnold's has a meaning and influence in literature, for we welcome all kinds, and indeed the glory of our age is that it would leave no voice, no claim unrecognized. But the fine gentleman, the purist, even the fine scholar, was probably never really less called for. Literature is already over-weighted with them, and henceforth revolts from being a mere profession, a select class. I doubt whether America will miss Arnold at all. We missed Carlyle hugely, and the taking away of Tennyson would make a great void here in the emotions and aesthetic intellect of the United States. There are three or four great scientists to-day in the British Islands any of whose deaths would cause a chill here. But I don't think anything of the kind will happen in the present case.

Commenting on his own article Whitman said: "I discussed Arnold in effect—throughout in such words—as one of the dudes of literature. Does not *Leaves of Grass* provide a place even for Arnold? Certainly, certainly: *Leaves of Grass* has room for everybody: if it did not make room for all it would not make room for one."³ On another occasion Whitman remarked that "Arnold had no genius—only a peculiarly clever order of refined talent. Arnold is much that sort of man who would be in his place as keeper of Her Majesty's Despatches, careful that never a word be misapplied or misspelled."⁴

JOHN HOWARD BIRSS

Columbia University

² Traubel, Horace, *With Walt Whitman in Camden*, I, 105.

³ *Ibid.*, I, 45.

⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 95.

ADDISON'S *LETTER FROM ITALY*

Mr. A. C. Guthkelch in the first volume of his edition of Addison's *Miscellaneous Works* printed (as he supposed for the first time) the early version of *A Letter from Italy* from a manuscript in Addison's handwriting (Bodleian MS. Rawl. Poet. 17). In the appendix he gave five pages of alterations in ink added to the manuscript by another hand.¹ The text as altered is substantially the text that was printed by Edmund Curll in a biographical compilation which he issued in 1741, *An Impartial History of the Life, Character, Amours, Travels, and Transactions of Mr. John Barber*. After describing Barber's disappointment in not finding in Italy a duplicate of the pastoral world reflected in Dryden's translation of "Virgil's *Pastorals*," Curll, or his hack, declared that the ingenuous alderman had brought back from Italy a real curiosity:

An *Italian Nobleman* was possessed of the *First Manuscript Copy* of Mr. Addison's Poetical Description of *Italy*, wrote by that Gentleman in the Year 1702, Feb. 19. N. S. The Alderman begged it of him; and as it differs very much from what is printed in *Tonson's 5th Miscellany*, we doubt not but it will prove acceptable to every Reader.²

It is possible that Addison's autograph manuscript of an early draft of *A Letter from Italy* was corrected by some one who had Curll's volume before him and accepted Curll's text as the final draft of the original version of the poem.³ Curll, indeed, may have been telling the truth. Where his text (based on the supposed manuscript brought back from Italy by Barber) differs from the altered Bodleian manuscript, it is sometimes closer (chiefly in spellings) to the text in the later, more familiar version. Curll's text of the first version of *A Letter from Italy* deserves consideration from the editor who completes Mr. Guthkelch's unfinished edition.

PAUL BUNYAN ANDERSON

Parsons College

¹ *Miscellaneous Works of Joseph Addison* (London, 1914), I, 491-95.

² *An Impartial History of Mr. John Barber* (London, 1741), 14.

³ The alternative is that Curll printed from Bodleian MS. Rawl. Poet. 17 after the alterations had been added to it.

THE THEORY OF A PLURALITY OF WORLDS AS A
FACTOR IN MILTON'S ATTITUDE TOWARD
THE COPERNICAN HYPOTHESIS

Consideration of the attitude of Milton toward the Copernican theory has apparently overlooked a fundamental point, namely: the tendency of his age to associate the hypothesis with the doctrine that other inhabited worlds exist, and the possible effect of this doctrine on the purpose of *Paradise Lost*. Some years after the publication of *Celestial Revolutions*, the spheres enclosing the simple Copernican system were eliminated, and the fixed stars were identified as suns spread irregularly in space, and attended by individual planetary systems. This expansion of the system stimulated theories that the number of suns and systems is infinite, that other bodies in the solar system contain living and rational creatures, and that there exist other systems, finite or infinite in number, which include inhabited planets.¹

Argument for the three last mentioned doctrines was necessarily supported by philosophical and theological premises. Perhaps because of a too free use of analogy, and certainly because of an absence of scientific proof, these theories were at times rejected by astronomers and others who accepted the simple Copernican system. There were also various combinations of the several hypotheses, containing two or more of the theories, which were accepted by some who opposed the original system, or withheld judgment concerning its truth. Whatever the combinations of these doctrines, however, they were more significant in their religious implications and in their effect upon the general outlook on life than was the simple Copernican hypothesis.

During the second decade of the Seventeenth Century, this hypothesis was not infrequently associated with one of the several theories of a plurality of worlds. By the middle of the century, the tendency of the highly speculative to employ it as a premise supporting the doctrine of additional worlds had so strengthened this association that it was not unusual for acceptance of the theory to imply acceptance of the doctrine. Indeed, a number of English-

¹ For the analysis of post-Copernican doctrines in this and the following paragraph, the writer is particularly indebted to Professor J. A. Lovejoy of The Johns Hopkins University.

men apparently interpreted the Copernican system as one which included a plurality of inhabited worlds, perhaps for the same reason which leads many people today to refer to our present cosmology as the Copernican.

The first important association of the heliocentric hypothesis with the theory of a plurality of inhabited worlds seems to have been made by Giordano Bruno.² After indicating his complete acceptance of the hypothesis in *Del infinito universo e mondi*, he proceeds to expand it, asserting that heaven is infinite, that the earth is a planet, and that the fixed stars are suns surrounded by other planets.³

The conception of the Copernican system as implying or suggesting a plurality of worlds soon acquired apparent authority. Galileo's observations with his newly invented telescope, his description of these observations in *Nuncius Sidereus* and Kepler's preface in his reprint of the *Starry Messenger* were interpreted by some as giving scientific color or reasonableness to what was a highly speculative supposition. For at least two centuries following Galileo, and particularly during the age of Milton, non-scientific men frequently believed that the Copernican system included or supported one of the several doctrines of a plurality of worlds. The tendency of various educated Englishmen to associate the heliocentric hypothesis with one or more of these doctrines may be illustrated by a few representative statements.⁴

Among the earliest of these associations are those made by Donne in *An Anatomie of the World* and *Ignatius His Conclave*.⁵ In the latter work he refers to Galileo's observations, and suggests that the

² Nicholas Cusanus and others may have suggested this theory to Bruno.

³ Weber, *History of Philosophy*, section 49. See also *De Immenso*.

⁴ Additional statements include references by Webster (*Works*, ed. Dyce, p. 71), Phineas Fletcher (*Poetical Works*, ed. Boas, I, 149), Habington (Chalmers, VI, 467), Shirley (*Works*, ed. Dyce, V, 24), Hammond (*Caroline Poets*, II, 517), and Ross, *The New Planet No Planet: or the Earth No Wandering Star*: except in the wandering heads of Galileans (London: F. Young, 1646).

⁵ As quoted by Simpson (*A Study of the Prose Works*, pp. 183 ff.), Donne satirizes what he considers the impertinence of Galileo and Kepler. In the concluding portions of this interesting satire, Donne has Loyola challenge the claim that Copernicus has rendered the greater service to the devil on the ground that Lucifer has profited nothing by the introduction of the new astronomy, and worst of all, it may be true.

Jesuits are the proper persons to colonize the moon.⁶ In the *Anatomie*, he links the hypothesis with the doctrine of a plurality of worlds or systems, and attacks it, at least indirectly, as a part of the new philosophy then disrupting the universe:

And new Philosophy calls all in doubt, . . .
 The Sun is lost, and th' earth, and no mans wit
 Can well direct him where to look for it.
 And freely men confesse that this world's spent
 When in the Planets, and the Firmament
 They seek so many new:
 Tis all in peeces, all coherence gone;
 All just supply, and all Relation:
 Prince, Subject, Father, Sonne, are things forgot.⁷

In his *Staple of News*⁸ and *News from the New World*,⁹ Jonson satirizes the invention which had given the Copernican hypothesis such prestige as to bring upon it the official disapproval of the Roman Church.¹⁰ In the latter work, his attack upon the telescope is followed by a satiric reference to the doctrine of another world in the moon. His statement, which would tend to associate the Copernican hypothesis, Galileo, the telescope, and this theory of a plurality of inhabited worlds in the minds of those attending the play, or reading it, concludes in this fashion:

Heralds. Our relation . . . is news . . . Of a new world. And new creatures in that world. In the orb of the moon. Which is found to be a world inhabited. With navigable seas and rivers.¹¹

In *A Cypresse Grove*, Jonson's friend Drummond describes the Copernican theory and the theory that the moon is inhabited as though they were associated in his mind. He finds these theories equally objectionable, as follows:

⁶ *Ibid.*

⁷ *Poetical Works*, ed. Grierson, I, 237.

⁸ *Works*, ed. Cunningham, II, 305.

⁹ *Ibid.*, III, 134.

¹⁰ According to Weber (*op. cit.*, section 48), the Roman Church reasoned in part that "if the earth is a planet, then it moves *in heaven*, and is no longer the anthithesis of heaven; then heaven and earth are no longer opposed . . . Moreover, to affirm . . . that the world is infinite, is to deny the existence of a heaven *apart* from the universe, of a supernatural order of things, of a God *on high*." Milton's interest in Galileo and his imprisonment suggests that he might have known of such objections.

¹¹ *Op. cit.*, III, 134.

The Earth is found to move, and is no more the centre of the Universe . . . Some affirme there is another World of men and sensitive Creatures, with cities and palaces in the Moone . . . Thus Sciences . . . have become Opiniones, nay Errores, and leade the Imagination in a thousand Labyrinthes.¹²

Drummond's acquaintance with and opposition to the doctrine that unnumbered worlds exist is shown in this statement in *Flowers of Sion*:

Were Worlds as many, as the Raies which streame
From Heavens bright Eyes, or madding Witts do dreame.¹³

Certainly the most extensive, if not the most interesting discussion of implications of the Copernican system as many educated laymen of the early Seventeenth Century apparently understood them, is given by Burton in the *Anatomy of Melancholy*. A portion of the full discussion included in this work, one so popular that it must have done much to associate the simple Copernican theory with some doctrine of a plurality of inhabited worlds, is as follows:

To grant this their tenet of the earth's motion: if the earth move, it is a planet and shines to them in the moon, and to the other planetary inhabitants, as the moon and they do to us upon the earth: but shine she doth, as Galileo, Kepler, and others prove, and then per consequens, the rest of the planets are inhabited, as well as the moon, which he grants in his dissertation with Galileo's *Nuncius Sidereus* 'That there be Jovial and Saturn inhabitants' . . . Then . . . the earth and they be planets alike, inhabited alike, moved about the Sun alike, why may we not suppose a plurality of worlds . . . Which Cardinal Cusanus, Walkarinus, Brunus, and some others have held, and some still maintain . . . These and such like insolent and bold attempts, prodigious paradoxes, inferences, must needs follow, if it once be granted, which Rotman, Kepler, Gilbert, Digges, Origanus, Galileo, and others maintain of the earth's motion.¹⁴

A number of the Englishmen who accepted the Copernican theory, as well as those who opposed it above, interpreted it as implying, supporting, or as inseparably connected with a theory of a plurality of worlds. John Wilkins, Bishop of Chester and pioneer of the Royal Society, closely associates it with this doctrine in his *Discovery of a new World*, and in *A Discourse Concerning a New Planet, That the Earth May be a Planet*. He states that the works

¹² *Poetical Works*, ed. Kastner, II, 78.

¹³ *Ibid.*, II, 46.

¹⁴ New Edition (London, 1898), pp. 326 ff.

of Galileo, Kepler, and others have convinced him that there is a world in the moon, and proceeds then to prove by Scripture that "a plurality of worlds doth not contradict any principle of reason or faith."¹⁵

In the extended cosmological discussion given in the second part of the *Platonick Song of the Soul*, Henry More moves definitely from the simple Copernican theory to the doctrine of an infinite number of inhabited worlds. He first attacks the "common sense" support of the geocentric system, and then asserts that objection to the rapid movement which the Copernican hypothesis would require of the earth is without foundation, for this motion is a natural one.¹⁶ Continuing, he discusses additional arguments in favor of "earth's annual and diurnal course," and mentions telescopic discoveries made by Galileo and others.¹⁷ With the heliocentric theory as a basis, he sets up the concept that the universe is composed of an infinite number of suns surrounded by inhabited planets, saying in part:

The centre of each severall world's a Sunne,
Whose shining beams and kindly warming heat,
About whose radiant crown the planets runne . . .
And . . . ever infinite such worlds there be.¹⁸

In *Paradise Lost*, Milton apparently follows the tendency of a number of those of his age, and associates the Copernican hypothesis with the general doctrine of a plurality of inhabited worlds. Not that he bases one upon the other, as More and others in part appear to do, but he writes of them as if they were linked in his mind. He says of the first "What if", and of the second, "What if"; "whether", concerning the first, and "whether" concerning the second. The mood of the description of one is that of the description of the other. These descriptions, only slightly separated by the repetition of "what if," are further unified, externally at least, by being placed without break between Raphael's admonitions concerning the futility and undesirability of cosmological investigation and speculation.¹⁹

¹⁵ Third Edition (London, 1640), pp. 19 ff. This edition includes both the *Discovery* and the *Discourse*.

¹⁶ *Complete Poems*, ed. Grosart, pp. 75 ff.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, pp. 81, 82.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, p. 95.

¹⁹ VIII, 119-178.

Whether this common treatment of the two theories indicates that Milton associated them almost inseparably, or considered that his readers frequently did so, is in a sense unimportant. The vital point is that he follows a definite tendency of his age in presenting them side by side and on a basis of apparent equality. This intimate association of the theories, whether a conscious or unconscious one, had an important bearing on the attitude which Milton could take toward the simple Copernican hypothesis. Informed and intelligent as he was, he would know or believe that advocacy of one indicated and almost required advocacy of the other. Public endorsement of the heliocentric system therefore implied or demanded endorsement of some doctrine of a plurality of worlds, and suggested approval of speculation concerning it. This in turn might be interpreted by many readers as providing some authority for such a thesis as Bruno grounded on the general doctrine, in which God is conceived as neither the creator nor the first mover, but as *natura naturans*, the universe, or the soul of the world.²⁰

Henry More, from Milton's university, had reasoned from the doctrine that there is an infinite universe, that such a universe is the proper creation of an infinite God, and that it is proof of a universal and infinite soul from which all things are made. Such a deity would rule these infinite realms and worlds in a similar, and logically, a somewhat mechanical manner, for More says:

And what is done in this terrestrial starre,
The same is done in every Orb beside.²¹

Because of such implications of the doctrine of a plurality of worlds, one would expect Milton to distrust it. His triple injunction that man solicit not his thoughts with matters hid, be lowly wise, and dream not of other worlds does indicate disapproval of speculation concerning it.²² However, his reference to the moon as possibly inhabited by translated saints or middle spirits shows that the general doctrine was not unattractive to him.²³ The description of every star as perhaps a world of destined habitation, while not favorable to the belief that other worlds were then inhabited, also suggests friendly interest in the theory.²⁴ Further-

²⁰ *Op. cit.*, section 49.

²¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 92.

²² VIII, 167; 173; 175.

²³ III, 458-461.

²⁴ VII, 621, 622.

more, despite the allusion to speculation concerning it as fume and fond impertinence,²⁵ he provides pleasing poetic descriptions of several phases of the doctrine.²⁶

The contradiction implied in the favorable attitude of these passages and the somewhat fundamentalistic warning regarding dreams of other worlds, is perhaps more apparent than real. It is to be expected that in a justification of the personal Christian God, Milton would rebuke a practice then leading some men to non-Christian concepts of Deity. That he does not deny the truth of the doctrine and does describe it in a friendly fashion regardless of its implications suggests a favorable personal attitude toward the belief. He apparently does not feel, however, that his public statement should indicate more than suspended judgment.

It appears reasonable to believe that because of the close association of the doctrine and the true hypothesis, Milton did not consider he was prepared to advocate openly the latter. His suspended judgment concerning the simple Copernican system is therefore apparently influenced by the similar attitude taken toward the doctrine of a plurality of worlds.

GRANT MCCOLLEY

Kansas Wesleyan University

VOLTAIRE'S NOTE ON *EMILE* ONCE MORE

In MLN for January, I pointed out that an important marginal note of Voltaire on Rousseau's *Emile* was incorrectly reproduced in the *Annales Jean-Jacques Rousseau* for 1905. In a most gracious manner, M. Bernard Bouvier, the author of the article in question, has informed me that the error on p. 284, l. 10, of *texte* instead of *reste*, due, not to the author's MS., but to the printer, was corrected in the *Errata* of the *Annales*, II (1906), 311. It is a pleasure to bring this fact to the attention of readers of my previous article.

GEORGE R. HAVENS

Ohio State University

²⁵ VIII, 194, 195.

²⁶ VIII, 140 ff.

REVIEWS

Journal of Washington Irving, 1823-24. Edited by STANLEY WILLIAMS. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1931. Pp. xviii + 278. \$3.50.

Stanley Williams, in this otherwise well edited *Journal*, falls into two errors, one minor, one major. The minor lapse is to be found on page 57 where Mr. Williams names John Howard Payne as the author, with Irving's assistance, of the translation of the German libretto of Weber's famous opera, *Der Freischütz*. The translation—in some measure also an adaptation—was by Irving, who may, however, have had some slight aid from Barham Livius. Payne had no share in the writing. Even if Mr. Williams was unwilling to accept the facts presented in my introduction to the first edition of Irving's manuscript, he might have had careful recourse to the pages of Thatcher T. Payne Luquer. In this publication of the letters of Payne and Irving, Irving and not Payne is revealed as the author of *Der Freischütz*. Possibly Mr. Williams's error is due to the fact that Payne tried to find a London producer for Irving's version at the same time that he was seeking to place plays of his own.

Far more grave is the statement (p. 3), "It has been said that Irving was a rejected and despondent suitor for the hand of Miss Emily Foster, but no conclusive evidence exists that this is so." Mr. Williams then goes on to suggest that the present *Journal* is an argument to the contrary. It is, if one feels the need for minor evidences, quite the opposite. Irving fell in love with Emily Foster in 1823 at Dresden. The Dresden Journals, drawn upon by Irving's earliest biographer, Pierre M. Irving, were first published in full in 1919 under the editorship of W. P. Trent and myself. A facsimile of one of the March pages was given, "showing" [I quote the note of the editors] "how lines were erased, presumably by Irving's biographer in his desire to perpetuate the tradition of Irving's exclusive devotion to his first love, Mathilda Hoffman. Still decipherable, however, are the words: 'Early part day triste—Emily delightful' in the seventh line. We surmise that the rest of the deleted portion referred to Irving's determination to put his fortune to the test, and that on March 31 (which entry shows another deletion—this time probably of the word 'depressed') Irving asked Emily to become his wife, but without success."

Yes, a surmise; but *why*, otherwise, did Irving's nephew rub out passages from the diary he was using in writing the biography? And another interesting question is *when*? Was it before or after Emily's sister Flora categorically stated that Irving sought Emily's

hand in marriage and adduced her own journal of the Dresden days in evidence? Pages from Flora's journal (published in 1863) were printed as an Appendix to the London edition of Pierre M. Irving's *Life and Letters of Washington Irving*, and no satisfactory reply came from the nephew who had deleted portions of his uncle's diary. It is as inconceivable that a well-bred English girl of an aristocratic family would, first in her private diary and, later, publicly write a false statement of this nature concerning a distinguished friend who had died, as it is impossible to understand why Pierre Irving should have deleted passages referring to Emily, unless to bolster up his sentimental presentation of Irving's youthful love affair, or to protect his challenged integrity as a scholar.

As a matter of fact, although Irving deeply loved and always cherished the memory of Mathilda Hoffman, he recovered sufficiently from the blow of her early death to enter not so very long after into the gay life of New York society. Although he became devoted to the delectable widow, Jane Renwick, the "Jeanie" immortalized by Robert Burns, perhaps not until the Dresden days did he deeply fall in love again. Mrs. Foster wished her daughter to accept him. Emily could not make up her mind. Some weeks after this March refusal (a conditional refusal?) Irving left Dresden for a trip through Bohemia. He returned to Dresden for a while. When the Fosters left Dresden, Irving also left. Then came the Paris days, whose record begins in the *Journal* edited by Mr. Williams and is continued in the *Journal* edited by Professor Trent and myself. Irving arrives at Paris on August 3, 1823. On March 13, 1824, after various letters to Mrs. Foster, he writes to both mother and daughter. Not until July does he visit them at their home in England. He arrives on July 6. The next morning he takes a long walk with Emily and her mother, his ally; and again in the afternoon. Subsequent to that, there is no walk with Emily, and she is never alone with him. When he leaves, it is Flora who gives him a parting gift. Is the surmise untenable that in England, as in Saxony, Emily is still unable to make up her mind to marry Washington Irving? But Irving has not given up hope. On August 26, again at Paris, he writes to Emily. On August 27, he re-writes his letter. On August 29 he sends the letter to Emily. It takes three days before this famous author, this fluent letter-writer, is satisfied with his missive to the young girl some twenty years his junior! Is it difficult to conjecture the contents of so deeply pondered an epistle?

One could adduce many other evidences contrary to the lovely Mathilda Hoffman theory advanced as explaining Irving's life-long bachelorhood. There is, for instance, Irving's story of "The Broken Heart" where he writes that though it may be possible for a woman to adhere forever to a lost love of youth, a man is not likely to do so. He is, one feels, writing autobiographically. Yet all corroborative details seem, though interesting for the research

student, really unimportant in view of the significant deletions in Irving's journals and the unqualified statements in the diary of Emily's sister.

Stanley Williams is one of the greatest scholars in the Irving field. His editing of the Journal from Dr. Roderick Terry's collection is but one of his many worth-while labors in this field—a delightful journal, full of wit and amusing anecdotes. If we have laid much stress on what seems to us so grave an error in his present work, it is in the hope that if Mr. Williams should ever attempt, as he is well qualified to do, a Life of Irving, he will not continue in the defense of a sentimental fiction so opposed to the stirrings of nature of men in general, and, in particular, of the susceptible heart of Washington Irving.

GEORGE S. HELLMAN

New York City

American Literature as an Expression of the National Mind. By

RUSSELL BLANKENSHIP. New York: Henry Holt, 1931. \$4.

It is at once the merit and the demerit of this book that it reflects faithfully the leading tendencies in American literary historiography of the past decade. As the author acknowledges, he has written on lines suggested by the "journalist" group—Bourne, Brooks, Macy, Mumford, etc.—and the massive work of Vernon Louis Parrington. He is also indebted to some of the authors of *The Reinterpretation of American Literature*. In consequence, the general organization of his book, as indicated in the table of contents, is superior, I think, to that of any previous survey of American literature, including the useful but essentially aimless *Cambridge History of American Literature*. Book I, pages 3-74, sketches "The Background," physical, racial, and intellectual; Book II, 77-191, studies "The Mind of Colonial America"; Book III, 195-387, deals with "Romanticism in America"; and Book IV, 391-724, carries the account to the present under the caption "The Triumph of Realism." A comparison between this scheme and that of nearly all the earlier histories of American literature would surely indicate that we are moving toward a more thoughtful scholarship in the field of the national letters.

The manner in which this scheme is applied in the text, however, indicates a serious defect both in the book and in the school of literary history which inspired it. Of 724 pages, only 2½ are devoted to Longfellow, 4 to Bryant, 6 to Poe, and 7 to Hawthorne. Taken together, the space given to these four American "classics" is the same as that given to Whitman alone. Even today this distribution of emphasis will strike most scholars and teachers as strange; fifty or a hundred years hence it may well be simply funny. How it happened is explained, after a fashion, by the

second part of the title, "as an Expression of the National Mind," together with the assertion in the introduction that our proper concern is with the "social import" of literature, not with "that esoteric goddess known as esthetic beauty." "Whether our literature is 'great' or not is of comparatively slight importance. It is profoundly expressive of the changing American mind." It is Parrington's argument over again. But Parrington used it to justify what his disciple rightly terms a monumental work of scholarship, a study of American liberal thought in its relations with American literature, which deservedly won the Pulitzer Prize in History. On the other hand, his pupil, Professor Blankenship, uses the same argument to justify a very different enterprise: the writing of a textbook for the college survey course in American literature. If the proportions of the textbook are paralleled in the reading of literature, the student will read as much in Whitman as he will read in Bryant, Poe, Hawthorne, and Longfellow combined; and he will have to read very closely a vast deal of writing that is perhaps neither "great" or "literature." Is it really obvious that American literature, in the colleges, should become merely a part of American history?

Even if one grants the validity of the author's purpose, the question remains, What is the national mind, in either its permanent or its changing aspects? Naturally enough, Mr. Blankenship has no assured knowledge of the permanent American mind, but he does profess to trace changes. The two great changes are indicated in his scheme by the terms romanticism and realism. If America, in its golden day, was romantic, why, one must insist again, was Poe dismissed in six pages and Longfellow in two and a half? And in the realistic age, was it proper to give the same attention to Arturo Giovannitti as to Edwin Arlington Robinson? At the Sorbonne, the professor of American literature likes to introduce his students to the recent "American" mind by means of Mr. Robinson; at the University of Berlin, the professor of American literature attempts the same task by means of Mr. Dooley. What is the American mind? Are we to look for the average, or for the peculiar and racy, or for the best that has been thought and said in America?

NORMAN FOERSTER

University of Iowa

The University of Texas Bulletin, July 8, 1930. Austin: University of Texas Press. \$1.00. (Studies in English, Number 10).

Of the four articles in this *Bulletin* devoted to Poe's use of sources, "Poe's Debt to Coleridge" by Floyd Stovall presents the most extended treatment. The author's purpose appears to be twofold: he has endeavored, first, to deal "more fully and systemati-

cally with Poe's dependence on Coleridge in poetry and prose fiction, in criticism, and in speculative thought than has heretofore been done"; and second, to prove that Coleridge was Poe's first and chief master and "the guiding genius" of the latter's "entire intellectual life". Quite the best part of this study touches its first purpose. The author presents as an organized whole a vast number of instances in which Poe's ideas agreed with those of Coleridge, or at least approximated them. He has collected under separate heads Poe's scattered critical opinions and has sub-divided these main heads into many lesser divisions. For example, he sees in Poe's theory of poetry alone nine "constituent ideas". All this assembled material Mr. Stovall has collated, point for point, with Coleridge's views on similar topics, and he has added, by way of interpretation, some illuminating discussions on the writers' opinions thus placed in juxtaposition. The chief excellence of the paper rests, however, in its author's lucid organization whereby the reader can examine for himself these cases of contact. His article becomes, therefore, splendid hand-book material for the serious student of Poe's work.

Not so successful, however, is the carrying out of the author's second purpose. Mr. Stovall has weakened his argument for Coleridge as Poe's chief master by contending too strenuously for Coleridge's influence when other influences are plainly discernible. Especially is this true when he tries to sweep away Poe's early indebtedness to Schlegel. In saying that Poe was drawn to Schlegel through Coleridge, and that he owed "little directly" to Schlegel, he fails to recognize Poe's early familiarity with *Blackwood* critics who commented on Schlegelian principles, and also the unquestionable similarity between Schlegel's text in the advice on the conduct of the drama and Poe's directions for writing a short story. Mr. Stovall further weakens his argument by what seems to be an effort to minimize the breadth of Poe's study. If Poe attributed ideas which he knew were held by Coleridge to other critics also holding these ideas, he was not, necessarily, as Mr. Stovall supposes, struggling to appear erudite. Rather it would seem that Poe was confirming in his own mind his knowledge of critical principles.

Particularly disappointing is the connection made between Coleridge and Poe in speculative thought. Coleridge had defined intelligence as the action of two counterbalancing forces, the attractive and the repulsive, acknowledging that he had borrowed these terms from astronomy. In one instance Mr. Stovall speaks of Poe's following this definition "in fragmentary ideas." In another instance, quite in contradiction to his former statement, he asserts that this reasoning appears in *Eureka* in Poe's whole "train of thinking". One familiar with Poe's seeking by recourse to physical law to confirm this doctrine of counteracting forces and with his use of the doctrine in his literary technique will feel that

through this contradiction Mr. Stovall has missed an opportunity of strengthening his whole thesis.

In spite of the above shortcomings, Mr. Stovall's large compilation of materials and especially his well ordered plan of procedure make his article a genuine contribution to Poe scholarship.

MARGARET ALTERTON

University of Iowa

Fitz-Green Halleck, an Early Knickerbocker Wit and Poet. By NELSON FREDERICK ADKINS. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1930. Pp. xiii + 461. \$5.

The subject of this tall, thick volume is the best illustration of what could happen to the Knickerbocker who never passed beyond the Salmagundi stage. Coming to New York at the age of twenty-three, he fell in with the literary virtuosos and cemented friendship with Joseph Rodman Drake with his jejune exclamation that "it would be heaven to lounge upon the rainbow and read Tom Campbell." He was uncomfortably aware of the prosaic drive of American life and disposed to lament the wane of romance, a sentiment to which he somewhat feebly reverted in his valedictory "Young America."

Yet his few successes were not in romantic writing but in the "Croaker Papers" of 1819, done in conjunction with Drake, and in "Fanny", both of them light social satires. His enthusiasm for Drake's "Culprit Fay" was quite indiscriminating and built up the myth about this hasty improvisation that was never honestly criticised until Poe in 1834 fairly disposed of the poem and condemned Drake as a culprit poet. In Halleck's surprise at originality in an American appeared the vital difference between himself and Drake. As fate would have it the more independent of the pair was taken off before his prime, and Halleck settled down into complacent Knickerbockerism.

People liked "Fanny", so he wrote a supplementary fifty stanzas for a jeu d'esprit that he had at first described as "spun out." While abroad in a moment of fine fury he wrote "Marco Bozzaris", "the keystone of the arch of my renown, if renown it be." But all the applause failed to rouse him to any real productivity. Publishers implored him for manuscript, but editions trickled along only of "The Croakers" and "Fanny" and "Alnwick Castle" and "Fanny" and "the Croakers." His fellow-authors challenged him to fulfill the promise of his early verse; he sat at public dinners where toastmasters acknowledged his presence; he was an incessant guest at private tables where he was remembered for anecdote and quotation rather than for any original utterances. For sixteen years, while Poe was never far from penury he lived in comfort and intel-

lectual indolence, and when in 1848 his employer-patron died leaving him a tiny annuity, he packed up and slipped back to Guilford, Connecticut, and the oblivion from which he had emerged.

All this is derivable from Mr. Adkin's voluminous study, but it is not the explicit burden of it. The man is taken more nearly at the estimate of his contemporaries and solemnly enshrouded in rhetoric.

The young man had inherited a breadth of imagination and fulness of life that clashed harshly with the restraint and bigotry imposed by his New England environment. Now freed from the narrow yoke of prejudice, Halleck at once found in the freer life of the city the liberty for which his heart yearned.

It was the liberty of the small boy who runs away after breakfast and gets home for lunch.

The same solemnity characterizes the scholarly treatment of the man as a creature of problems which demand circuitous and prolonged solutions. And occasionally the parade of pedantry is so occupied with its own appearance that it misses the most obvious of steps; as in the speculation on the significance of Y. H. S. as a signature, which the author regards as insoluble, although in addition to being subscribed to three poems, it is also used at the end of a letter. And this in a day when "Your Humble Servant" was the commonest of formulae.

Mr. Adkins's book is a useful compilation. In its fulness it will never need to be supplemented. In its factual accuracy it seems to be beyond reproach. As a reference book it is valuable. As a piece of critical writing, however, it is as insecure as were the critical findings of Fitz-Green Halleck himself.

PERCY H. BOYNTON

University of Chicago

Hypnotic Poetry: a Study of Trance-Inducing Technique in Certain Poems and its Literary Significance. By EDWARD D. SNYDER. With a Foreword by JAMES H. LEUBA. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1930. Pp. xii + 162. \$2.00.

The author, evidently a competent oral reader of poetry, has found that, in reading certain poems, he exercises upon his auditors a peculiar "spell-weaving" or "trance-producing" effect, for which he seeks explanation in psychological theory. His exposition divides poems into three classes; first, "spell-weaving" or "hypnotic"; secondly, as opposed to these, "intellectualist"; and thirdly, since these two kinds run together, "mixed" or "semi-hypnotic" poems. His aim in the first four chapters is to show

that poems of the first class, which in a "loose, popular sense" have generally been regarded as spell-weaving, are "actually and technically"—i. e., in the light of recognized psychological theory—hypnotic. The remaining chapters—to quote the Preface—"make practical applications of this idea to individual poems and to topics of a more general nature," including "poetic inspiration" and "free verse in America." True reading and criticism of poetry will, as the author hopes, be greatly aided once his distinctions are recognized and appropriate treatment given to each of his classes.

The argument, though, as far as it goes, not open to serious objection, is rather popular than seriously critical, from either the literary or psychological point of view, and somewhat careless, not always avoiding illogical and inconsistent statement. Space permits but one example. On p. 18 the "state of trance, sometimes called *hypnoidal*" is "clearly demonstrable as abnormal"; but on p. 28, "in the *hypnoidal* or light state of trance, the subject's behavior is practically normal." The serious critic will use this word "normal" with circumspection.

One may fully agree with Professor Leuba that "poetic criticism is in much need of an assistance which the psychologist only can give," without finding in this volume very much that is new or helpful. Readers of poetry have always recognized the spell-weaving power of poetry, from the "hypnotic incantations of savage tribes" (which the author notes) to Shelley's "incantation of this verse" in the *West Wind*. They are in little need of the demonstration which Professor Leuba believes this volume to have accomplished,—namely, "the existence of a type of poetry which owes its attraction to a method of composition, the effect of which is to limit the intellectual activity, . . . and thereby to free in some measure the emotional life from the trammel of critical thinking." They have indeed always recognized the very devices which are here enumerated as trance-producing,—such as "an unusually perfect pattern of sound," "a certain vagueness of imagery," "the use of refrain or of frequent repetition," the use of "suggestion," etc. It does not help us much merely to put old ideas into new psychological terms, or to call familiar experiences "*hypnoidal*." It is sometimes enlightening indeed only to have old problems regarded from quite new angles; accordingly some readers will find their conceptions sharpened by a perusal of this book. But what poetic criticism really hopes for from psychology is not restatements but substantial contributions.

F. C. PRESCOTT

Cornell University

Additional Chapters on Thomas Cooper. By MAURICE KELLEY.
Orono: University of Maine Press, 1930. Pp. 100. (University of Maine Studies).

The purpose of this work is to interpret Cooper in the light of the latter's "biography and of the sciences to which he contributed" and thus "effect a fuller conception of Cooper's works and versatility". To this end Mr. Kelley surveys Cooper's writings of the latter part of the 18th century in England and the first half of the national period in America. He presents Cooper in his connections in both countries with learned societies devoted to science and in his interests in popularizing education in America. In both fields of Cooper's endeavor, Mr. Kelley professes to find a binding thought of radicalism, and, in forming a general conclusion, asserts that in neither of these fields is his author a significant figure.

Not altogether fair is Mr. Kelley's treatment of Cooper's achievements. He allows his disapproval of the latter's unorthodox opinions to blind him to the value of what Cooper actually accomplished in pioneer work in America in both science and education. Although he calls attention to the facts that Cooper held certain scientific theories now pronounced reliable by modern science, that he entered a "plea for a critical test of historicity" now favored by modern scholarship, and that he foreshadowed the plan of the present-day state university, Mr. Kelley, nevertheless, by various methods, lessens the importance of this constructive thinking. For example, he intimates that Cooper's radicalism motivated his adoption of Hutton's igneous theory in explanation of the earth's geologic changes. There is thus an attack on the scientist's sincerity. According to Mr. Kelley, all of Cooper's work in science and education illustrates "the mental vagaries of a man regarded by his age as an intellectual leader". It is, in fact, with surprise that Mr. Kelley notes the praise bestowed on Cooper by certain of the latter's contemporaries. He holds more to the view of those in Cooper's time who, in bitterly opposing the man's unorthodoxy, could see little good in his scholarship. Mr. Kelley briefly mentions that Jefferson "praised Cooper's brilliance". But Jefferson did far more; in numerous instances he testified to Cooper's special abilities in furthering the scholarly interests of America in the national period.

The chief merit of Mr. Kelley's work lies in the fact that he has painstakingly assembled Cooper's writings, many of which lay scattered through the periodicals of his time. He has not, however, so interpreted these writings that they reveal their author with any degree of fullness for what he was—pioneer scientist and educator. He has not allowed the age to explain the man.

MARGARET ALTERTON

University of Iowa

The Golden Thread. By PHILLO M. BUCK, JR. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1931. Pp. xx + 552. \$4.00.

The professor of comparative literature at the University of Wisconsin has written an elementary, readable survey of world literature, especially, of course, European literature, strung together on a golden thread. This golden thread he calls tradition, not traditions, for, as he conceives, "mankind, in spite of varied language and culture, is at heart one," "human nature, in spite of differences in age and background, has remained essentially the same." This doctrine, itself long traditional, and still maintained by humanists, is daily rejected by modernists who profess to see nothing in life but relativity, nothing in literature but the whirling of fashion.

That there is relativity as well as permanence Professor Buck is well aware: the great authors who defy time are yet children of their own age. We are here on the verge, it would appear, of a fruitful attempt to suggest a division between the constant and the inconstant in literary values. This is one of the central tasks of higher literary scholarship in our groping times. If Professor Buck had made bold to attempt it, he would have produced a useful book, useful in its provocative weaknesses as well as in its positive contribution; he would at least have encouraged debate among scholars on an important subject. That he did not do so is to be explained, curiously enough, by his own fascination by the principle of change. "It is not a static or unchanging tradition," he declares, "the pattern it weaves is as variable as human nature itself, and its end no man can predict. In this it is like nature itself, subject to its own inner laws, and modifying itself constantly to meet every new occasion." This cannot be questioned; it is as true as the assertion above that mankind is at heart one. The point is one concerning tone and emphasis. The author promises, and gives us, "unexpected surprises." As we move on through the ages, the story of literature shifts from one sort of triumph to another as if man were capable (as he is) of every manner of thing, and yet everything seems to develop naturally from what went before. The richness of human nature, its avoidance of sheer repetition, paralleled in physical man by endless individuality of face and figure, renders the story one of high romantic charm. But the plot, the action, the unity of the story? Here the courage of the author flags. He falls back on the misty notion that all diversities, past, present, and future, are somehow aspects of unity, which like all pantheistic views tends to be nearly meaningless. A more sharply defined picture he postpones till all of the future becomes past. At this juncture, or junction, that will give us a tedious wait.

NORMAN FOERSTER

University of Iowa

The Letters of Robert Burns. Edited from the Original Manuscripts. By J. DE LANCEY FERGUSON. Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1931. 2 vols. Pp. xlix + 382; 413. \$10.00.

Professor Ferguson's work represents the most notable contribution to Burns scholarship since the publication of Henley and Henderson's Centenary edition, *The Poetry of Robert Burns* (Edinburgh, 1896-97. 4 vols.). During the thirty-five years that have elapsed since these volumes appeared much has been done towards adding to our knowledge of Burns. Some old myths have been exploded; not a few uncertainties have been clarified; a large number of previously unknown letters have been printed—for the most part in the pages of the *Annual Burns Chronicle*, now under the competent editorship of Mr. J. C. Ewing. But the student who wished to see Burns in his habit as he lived has been handicapped by the fact that his letters—the chief source of first-hand biographical information—were scattered among several editions each of which inaccurately claimed to contain his complete works, and, more disheartening, by the knowledge than no one of these editions would show what Burns actually wrote, but only what some previous editor had said that he wrote. And whenever one placed a Burns manuscript beside a well-meaning early nineteenth-century editor's "accurate copy" of that manuscript, one discovered such discrepancies as made one distrust even those editors who intended to be honest.

The trouble began with Dr. James Currie, the Liverpool physician who in 1800 published the first collected edition of Burns's works. In his "Dedication" Currie announced quite frankly that "all topics are omitted in the writings, and avoided in the life of Burns, that have a tendency to awaken the animosity of party." But Currie did more than omit some of Burns's most characteristic utterances on religion and politics. He softened his language, altered his dates, and in general took such liberties with his texts as he or his literary advisors thought desirable. Later editors reproduced Currie's versions of the published letters, and when adding new texts, followed Currie's general editorial practise. Even the Chambers-Wallace *Life and Works of Robert Burns* (Edinburgh, 1896. 4 vols.), the best edition of both prose and verse that has yet appeared, is sadly mutilated by lacunae in the texts of previously unpublished letters, and is but little better than Currie *et als* as regards what had previously been printed.

Professor Ferguson has corrected this situation, and has given the texts of seven hundred and thirteen of Burns's letters, of which some five hundred and fifty are taken directly from either the original documents or photostatic reproductions. The accuracy of these transcripts is beyond praise. Here one may read Burns's

own words, colored with all his significant and characteristic mannerisms of spelling and punctuation. So at last, a century and a half after Burns began writing, it has been made possible for the reader to enjoy the poet's voluminous correspondence unmutilated by omissions or editorial alterations.

In preparing this material for the press Professor Ferguson has several times re-dated letters by the simple process of turning the sheet over and looking for the post-mark—an obvious method of determining when a letter was actually mailed, but one which no previous editor seems to have thought of. And once or twice this process has resulted in clarifying baffling obscurities.

The editorial material which accompanies the text is ample, pertinent, reliable and never obtrusive. In each case the history of the letter is carefully recorded: place and date of first publication, and location of the manuscript if discoverable. Quotations are localized, and information necessary to an understanding of the text supplied. A succinct glossary of "Dialect and obsolete words" will be useful to some readers, though Burns rarely dropped into the vernacular when writing prose; the "Appendix: Notes on Burns's Correspondents" contains information available nowhere else, and invaluable to any student of Burns and his world; the Index is of the sort which such a publication warrants: analytic, intelligently complete, and easy to use. And the "Introduction: The Letters and the Man," is the most informing evaluation of Burns that has appeared in a long day.

One Scottish reviewer has suggested that Professor Ferguson has erred in certain of his reassignments of previously published letters. This may conceivably prove to be the case, for it is well known that there are in existence letters by Burns, withheld from publication by their Scottish owners, which might force a rewriting of one or two episodes in the poet's career. But until the owners of these letters permit them to be read and utilized by scholars, neither editor nor biographer can be held responsible for failure to factor them into the equation. And no matter what may turn up in the way of unpublished material, Ferguson's edition will remain a credit not only to his industry and learning but to the world of American scholarship.

FRANKLYN B. SNYDER

Northwestern University

Deutsche Literatur. Reihe Barock: Barockdrama, Band 3: Das Schauspiel der Wanderbühne. Herausgegeben von Univ.-Prof. Dr. WILLI FLEMMING. Leipzig: Verlag von Philipp Reclam jun., 1931.

A stimulating but, nevertheless, a somewhat disappointing volume. Every student who has busied himself with the "barnstorming" tours of the English Comedians in Germany during the last decade of the 16th century and especially the first three decades of the 17th, will welcome the more ready accessibility of the Graz 1608 version of *Niemand und Jemand*, the earliest and indeed the only text which comes to us directly from the hands of the English actors, and also of Blümel's version of *Der Jude von Venetien*. The selections from Rist's *alleredelste Belustigung* (1666), with its evident reference to *Hamlet*, is significant, but I greatly regret the omission of Rist's account of a *Peter-Squenz* performance, mentioned incidentally on page 10 of the *Einführung*. Indeed no objection can be raised to any one of the individual selections, with the possible exception of the last: *Von einem Buler und Bulerin* by Herzog Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig. His *Ungeratener Sohn*, as originally announced for the volume, would have been more typical both as regards the "blood and thunder" and the supernatural.

If, however, the selections be considered as a group, representative of the *Wanderbühne* from the nineties of the 16th century to the end of the 17th, judgment cannot be so favorable. For the earlier period, that of the English Comedians, there is no selection from the *Collection* of 1620, also no example of the *Spanish Tragedy*, *Titus Andronicus* type, which formed after all the backbone of the earlier repertoire. Of the later, more strictly German *Wanderbühne*, there is but one piece: *Aemilius Paulus Papinianus*, the original of which appears in the first volume of the series. For the period of the English Comedians we already have the earlier publications of Tittmann and Creizenach which the present volume supplements very acceptably but for the later *Wanderbühne* there exist no such collections. It is a great pity that the abundant material was not presented in two volumes—one specifically for the English Comedians and the second for the subsequent German *Wanderbühne*. The result of the present compression into one is that neither period is fairly represented.

A like general criticism may be made of the *Einführung* (1-69). As was to be expected of Professor Flemming there are many very suggestive passages, especially such as relate to sociological and economic conditions, *e. g.*, the comparison with the "movies" of our own day is very apt. But it is no *Einführung*, rather a compact and concise critical essay, so concise that at times a definite

reference is lacking, *e. g.*, 6, 10-8 from bottom (Is the reference to Augsburg or Nürnberg?); 24, 8-6 from bottom (complete omission of reference to *Der Jude von Venetien* III, 5). The discussion of the *Gestalt der Bühne* (41-49) is particularly unsatisfactory. Instead of portraying the very significant advance of the stage in Germany during the 17th century in its historical development, Professor Flemming starts with the highly developed stage of Stranitzky in Vienna, at the close of the period, and then by a process of elimination finally arrives back at the much simpler stage construction of the English Comedians. His assumption of the *Mittelgardine* for this earliest type of stage, on the ground that it was current in England, although admittedly mentioned neither in the *Collection* of 1620 nor in the plays of Heinrich Julius of Braunschweig, is scarcely warranted.

It is also exceedingly unfortunate that the many problems of comparative literature, which just in this period confront the student on every hand, are nowhere even hinted at.

In points of detail the following are to be noted:

Misprints: 36, 8 *Andalosie* should read *Andalosia*. 56, 10 *Bocaccia* should read *Boccaccio*. 72, 1 *pouben* should read *puoben* (cf. reference 332). 75, 1 *vndt* should read *undt* (cf. 334, 8. The same misprint also occurs in Bischoff's text). 84, 14 *jezzung* should read *jezund*. 218, 28 comma after *gesehen*. 233, 5 *Pritz* should read *Printz*. 339 (226, 30) *Cornbiena* should read *Cornbüna*. 339 (229, 21) *Heffelein* should read *häffelein*. 339 (282, 2) *gehalen* should read *gehalten*. 339 (290, 13) *aufmachen* should read *auszmachen*. 340 (316, 3) *vertyhet* should read *Verthyet*. 340 (321, 18) *Gloth* should read *Gloch*.

In the text of *Niemand and Jemand*, the name of King Arzngal (the spelling of the *Dramatis Personae*) appears in various forms. This, however, should scarcely occasion five different spellings in the *Einführung*: 21 *Artzngal*; 24 *Herzngal*; 26 *Arengal*; 36 *Arczngal*; 54 *Herczngal*.

This name illustrates also a question of considerably greater significance, the extremely frequent appearance of *cz* instead of *tz*. Instead of accepting a suggestion of Slavic influence Flemming writes (333): *Möglicherweise handelt es sich um eine Schreibgewohnheit, die das t zum blossen hakenförmigen Ansatz verkleinert hat, der deswegen unserem Auge als dem c verwandt erscheint*. From some considerable experience with Lucerne manuscripts of about the same period in which just this is undoubtedly the case, I am strongly of the opinion that Flemming's surmise is correct. In any case, however, it is a question which should have been decided before the text was reprinted.

Quotations are occasionally rather carelessly made: 42, 4 from bottom: "*Juden von Venedig*" (V, 5): "*die innere Scena eröffnet sich, sietz der Herzog usw . . . zu gericht* should read: '*Jude von*

Venetien' (V, 6): *Die Scena eröffnet sich, darin sitzen der Hertzog usw . . . zugericht.*" Tittmann fares badly at the hands of the editor. In the five lines quoted at the bottom of 21 six slight errors were noted, while on 22, 10 *auch* should read *euch*.

The notes contained in the critical apparatus (332-340) are entirely inadequate. Certainly *Haszstarigkheit* (82, 6) but *Halls-terigkheit* (88, 24) should have suggested a corrected reading of the former; or for 195, 29 f.: *Meine kleider dich ich abgelegt*, a note would seem to be imperative. These are but two examples of many which might be cited. The interpretation (334, to 95, 9) *Mar* = *Mohr* is very questionable. It is suggested, to be sure, by Bischoff, but with a question-mark following. The context would seem to demand *Nar*. The most liberally annotated selection is the last, but of the 47 notes here offered all but 6 (*i. e.* 41) are taken verbatim, or with insignificant changes, from Tittmann's edition of the same play. There is, however, no acknowledgement of this indebtedness to the earlier editor.

M. BLAKEMORE EVANS

Ohio State University

Die realistische Tendenz in Grabbes Dramen. Erwin Guido Kolbenheyer als Dichter des Lebensproblems. By FRIEDRICH WILHELM KAUFMANN. Northampton, Mass.: Smith College. 76 pp. (Smith College Studies in Languages, Vol. XII, No. 4.)

Im zweiten dieser beiden Aufsätze gibt der Verfasser eine Einführung in das Werk Kolbenheyers, dessen weltanschauliche Fundierung er besonders mit Hilfe der *Bauhütte* festlegt, ehe er mit der Analyse der Romane und Dramen beginnt. Wert und Bedeutung des Dichters für unsere Zeit sind auf diese Weise klar herausgearbeitet und eine Grundlage ist geschaffen für das nicht leichte Erfassen Kolbenheyerscher Probleme.

Wichtiger ist indessen der Grabbeaufsatz. Grabbe hat lange auf ein Verständnis warten müssen, das sich jetzt wenigstens anzubahnen scheint. Die deutsche Vorliebe für tragischen Individualismus, dem freilich der Dichter selbst Vorschub geleistet, war bei ihm von vornherein auf das Kainszeichen des Genies eingestellt, und erst die neuere Entwicklung auf Gemeinschaftswerte hin beginnt nun die gegenteiligen Züge zu erschließen. Kaufmann weist in seiner Arbeit überzeugend nach, daß die bisherige Annahme, Grabbe trete unbedingt für das Recht des Genies gegen die Dummheit und Stumpfheit der Masse ein, unzutreffend ist. Der Romantiker in Grabbe sehe sein Recht in der Überschreitung der naturgegebenen Grenzen, der Realist in ihm sehe in dem

gleichen Versuche eine ungerechtfertigte Überhebung des Individuums.

Im Laufe seiner Entwicklung verschiebt sich nun die Bewertung der beiden Standpunkte im Dichter, sodaß wir am Anfang im *Herzog Theodor von Gothland* die Zertrümmerung aller objektiven Werte und damit auch des Ichwertes durch den Solipsismus des Helden erleben, am Ende den Untergang Napoleons und Hannibals durch die Nichtanpassung an die empirischen Gegebenheiten.

Während noch Wilhelm Schöttler in seiner im vorigen Jahre erschienen Dissertation (*Über die innere Motivierung in Grabbes Dramen*) die Wichtigkeit des Ideals der Volksgemeinschaft für Grabbe erkennt, nimmt er dennoch an, daß der Dichter davon enttäuscht worden sei, da Napoleons Überwinder diesen mit nichts Besserem als der Restauration hätten ersetzen können. Das ist indessen aus dem Drama *Napoleon* durchaus nicht zu erschließen, und Kaufmann findet mit Recht die Quintessenz desselben eher in Blüchers Schlußworten als in der Prophezeiung des Helden. Dieser "hat die realen Bedingungen seiner Macht überschritten, hat sich der Strömung der Zeit entgegengestemmt, hat aus persönlicher Eitelkeit die barocke und romantische Ideologie der Fürsten mit ihrem Gottesgnadentum mitgemacht" (S. 24). Demgegenüber steht der Zeitgeist der Revolution und ein kräftiges Gemeinschaftsgefühl unter seinen deutschen Gegnern, das sich nicht mit "Überzahl von Schwachen und Elenden," wie es Napoleon tut, charakterisieren läßt. Die These, "daß der beste Führer wertlos ist, wenn das Volk nicht zu folgen willens ist, und zweitens, daß ein Volk, das wirklich innere Kraft und Ziel hat, auch mit geringwertigeren Führern zum Erfolg gelangen kann," sieht Kaufmann dann in der Hannibaltragödie zur vollen Durchführung gebracht. Seine Ausführungen werden, nebenbei gesagt, gestützt durch die gleichzeitigen Aufsätze von F. J. Schneider in der *Dt. Vjs.* 1930, H. 3 und im *Euphion* 1931, H. 2.

Übrigens zeigt sich gerade bei Grabbe die ganze Verworrenheit unserer literargeschichtlichen Stempel. Wenn ein Mensch Frühromantiker, Jungdeutscher, Spätromantiker und Klassizist ist (was sich alles in Einzelzügen belegen läßt), was ist er dann?

ERNST FEISE

Arthur Symons als Kritiker der Literatur. Von MAX WILDI.

Anglistische Forschungen, Heft 67. Heidelberg: C. Winter, 1929. Pp. 145. M. 7.50.

After touching upon Symons's rather morbid childhood, and noting that it was Pater's *Renaissance* that opened up to him the world of art and literature, Part I of Herr Wildi's monograph

proceeds to consider chronologically Symons's principal critical essays as far as the end of the nineteenth century, tracing the manifold influences, literary and environmental, which color the work of his formative period. Part II, occupying two-fifths of the book, analyzes the critical powers of his maturity, and adds a note on the weakening of his powers since 1920.

For a critic so impatient of imitative work in others, Symons reflects surprisingly often the thinking and even the stylistic peculiarities of the authors who have successively appealed to him. Hence his sympathetic preoccupation, at one time or another, with impressionism, naturalism, symbolism, and decadent art. He falls in turn under the spell of Pater, Browning, Yeats, Henley, Patmore, Huysmans, Verlaine, Baudelaire, Mallarmé, Maeterlinck and a multitude of other contemporary writers, not always freeing himself from the influence of the earlier favorite while endeavoring to assimilate the later. His indebtedness to Pater, for instance, is apparent everywhere in his writings.

Wildi has rendered a service by indicating the various sources of his author's sometimes inconsistent theories and shifting points of view. We are impressed by Symons's limitations: the narrow range of his interests; his over-emphasis of the importance of art as a stimulus of the senses; his tendency to read his own decadent fancies into the thinking, for instance, of Byron and Keats; his inability to understand either religious mysticism or symbolism; his lack, in general, of *phantasie*; his inability to arrive at any consistent conception of drama. Wildi shows the weakness in Symons's powers of generalization: his interest, even in his *Romantic Movement in English Poetry*, in authors as individuals, rather than as factors in literary movements; his tendency to become vague and vacillating when he attempts to formulate critical principles. Perhaps the most persistent and most characteristic theory brought out by Wildi's analysis is Symons's ever strengthening conviction that the only true poetry is a kind of "embodied ecstasy," a purely personal reaction, intoxicating the senses by means of its rhythmical magic, although metrically never forcing accent or word order.

Wildi's study is well organized, searching, fully documented, compact, and discriminating. It is to be regretted that the formal bibliography is not more nearly complete. There are a score of typographical errors, mostly in passages quoted in English.

F. F. FARLEY

Wesleyan University

Robert Bridges: Recollections by LOGAN PEARSALL SMITH, and
His Work on the English Language by ELIZABETH DARYUSH.
Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1931. Pp. 481-513. \$1.00. (S.
P. E. Tract No. XXXV.)

The two essays by Logan Pearsall Smith and Elizabeth Daryush, daughter of the great Laureate, are indispensable to admirers of Robert Bridges and his work. Mr. Smith's recollections of the founding of the S. P. E. are charmingly conversational and include material which no student of the Age of Bridges would spare. Together with an account of the Society, they include intimate portraits of Robert Bridges himself, Walter Raleigh, and others of the group; many hitherto unpublished letters from Bridges and one from Henry James. Typical of the jauntiness with which Robert Bridges carried his honours and genius are his characterization of the Laureateship as "my queer appointment", and a description, in another letter, of his work on the last book of "The Testament of Beauty": 'I am still unfortunately busy with my long poem, which I thought to have finished by now. But my fourth and last book on Ethick has been more difficult than I expected, for tho I knew what I meant to say I did not guess how very difficult it would be to poetise—but it is getting on; and John Sampson, who came to stay with us for a few days, approved of it. It is very good fun but hard work, and I am generally gratified after a morning's work on it. . . .' Some years ago, at the time Bridges was being taken to task for re-establishing friendly relations with the German professors after the war, the writer of this review received a letter in similar vein in which the Poet Laureate described attacks on him in terms of highly amusing sport. It is only the giants of the earth who can thus lightly carry great burdens, and one happily agrees with Mr. Smith's concluding sentence: "There was, indeed, a giant who took part in those adventures, and that giant was Robert Bridges."

Mrs. Daryush's contribution is largely composed of excerpts from Robert Bridges's essays which concern his work on the English language. Exceedingly well-chosen, these selections dealing with "language as sound," "the choice of words," "order of words," "the poverty of English accident," "poetic diction," and so forth, reveal with what careful study the greatest poet of our age laid the foundation for his work; and do much, by their disclosure of hard-working genius, to refute the romantic notion that untutored inspiration is a sound or even a possible theory for an approach to poetic composition.

ROBERT HILLYER

Harvard University

Royster Memorial Studies. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1931. Pp. viii + 332 + v. \$4.00.

When the October (1931) number of "Studies in Philology" was designated by the Editorial Board as a memorial to Professor James Finch Royster, very ready was the response to the request for contributions. Scholarly companions, quick to honor "so worthy a friend and fellow", brought many and varied offerings. Of the thirty-seven articles in a volume everywhere creditable to heart and head, no less than eighteen come from former pupils and colleagues at the University of North Carolina, where Royster's devoted service as dean and professor and editor did much to found and foster in his own and kindred fields a workshop of wise spirits. Chicago, where he studied, Colorado and Texas, where he taught, and yet other spheres of his influence send many literary tokens of high regard.

How far is it significant of the present trend of research that, of the nearly forty papers published by "Studies in Philology" in honor of its lamented editor, but four or five are devoted to his favorite topic, language; and that only the linguistic articles are classed by the compilers as "philological"? The implication that philology controls no larger province than that of forms of speech runs counter not only to the connotation of the titles of this and other journals of like name, but to the comprehensive hospitality of Mr. Royster's own editorial policy. Let it be quickly added that the somewhat scanty linguistic diet is not the least nutritious of the food for all kinds of appetites that the heaping table of contents offers.

Another distinction between the prevailing scholarship of to-day and of yesterday! A generation ago such a book as this would have been, if not generally at least generously, medieval. Now only one fifth of the themes antedate Shakspeare. And the survey of certain topics of the modern period frankly eschews far retrospection. One looks forward from Spenser to the sprightly Lamb, not backward to the sluggish beasts of the Seven Deadly. Alain de Lille is transformed from a "Universal Doctor" of the twelfth century to a "German" of the seventeenth. And the lure of medieval legend is steadfastly resisted in favor of more recent forms of the story of Fair Rosamond. Yet "literary history," faithfully pursued, imparts to the book its larger values. Hence it was meet and right on scholarly as well as personal grounds that Professor Edwin Greenlaw, sometime Royster's colleague at North Carolina and ever a sturdy champion of the historical study of literature, should write the sympathetic dedication to the volume. Of his own loyalty and love and zeal the story that he tells of his friend may also be narrated. The book of "Memorial Studies" thus suggests a twofold cause of grief linked with the inspiration of manifold endeavor.

University of Vermont

FREDERICK TUPPER

Philosophical Poems of Henry More, comprising Psychozoia and Minor Poems. Edited with an Introduction and Notes by GEOFFREY BULLOUGH. Manchester University Press, 1931. Pp. xc + 250.

In this, the fourth volume published by the University of Manchester under the terms of the Ward Bequest, Professor Bullough, feeling that "something less than justice had been done to Henry More's poetry even by admirers of his character and doctrine", reprints "all of More's verse that is worthy of resuscitation." Impressive though the volume is (and Henry More, who loved fine books and more than once pleaded with his publishers for the qualities he would find here, would be the first to admire these pages in which he has been embalmed and treasured up), it actually contains only a small proportion of the amount of verse the prolix Cambridge Platonist composed. Not even his most ardent disciple will suggest that all More wrote should be republished. Rather, indeed, we may question whether, since the poetry was available in the Grosart edition, with all its limitations, the republication of some of the less readily accessible prose works would not have been of more value. But it would be churlish to criticize the good we have merely because of regret for another good we might have had.

Yet even though we may welcome any book which serves to give more emphasis to that remarkable band of which More was one of the leaders, I personally must continue to regret the omission of the *Infinite of Worlds*, which seems to me not only the most original of More's philosophical poems and a significant landmark in seventeenth-century thought, but a poem which exemplifies in high degree the very qualities Professor Bullough praises as characteristic of More's best work: it possesses that "curious diagrammatic quality" which More shared with Dante; even more than in *Psychozoia*, the descriptions in this poem "are flung off with a telescopic vision and a speed which convey something of the grandeur of the physical world, and the forces at work within it."

It is his analysis of these and other poetic qualities in More's work which gives Professor Bullough's Introduction its real value. Most of the critical apparatus which accompanies such work as More's must necessarily be tedious, for so abstruse and purposely involved is much of his allegory that editor and reader alike agree with Thomas Vaughan who remarked drily: "Thou didst well to taylor it with an interpretation." There is therefore little scope for originality in the editor's explanation, since More himself so elaborately annotated his work. Nor is the present editor's interpretation of More's character and of his place in his generation marked by originality. Indeed, one regrets here—as in so many of the modern works on More—a tendency to relegate him affectionately

to some twilight of the gods, to consider him as quaint and charming, but somehow completely detached from the life about him. "He was, even more than Milton," writes Professor Bullough, "something of an anachronism before he died." Yet if ever two men were made what they were by the generation which produced them, they were Milton and More. And though I should agree that a change came over More after the 1660's, I continue to protest such statements as, "His intellectual development was quite at variance with the spirit of the new age."

Yet after all Professor Bullough is not pretending that this is a study of More's relation to his age. He has, except for a few paragraphs, limited himself to a study of More as a poet, and here he has much to say that has not been said. Indeed, his is the only really thoughtful estimate of More's poetic abilities. He has analyzed in more detail than any preceding critic More's relationship to Spenser; he has suggested various other possible literary relationships. Most of all he has suggested, briefly but acutely, the part More played in the Metaphysical movement, and has given us a new appreciation of More as a satirist. His interpretation of the various elements which make More primarily a "philosophical" rather than a "metaphysical" poet is illuminating. The reader comes to reevaluate the poet, and to read the abstruse poems themselves with new appreciation, seeing in their author one who "surpasses all his predecessors in ingenuity of systematic exposition"; one who is "interested primarily in metaphysical forces rather than in people and things"; one whose poetic imagination was stirred less by people and things than by abstract ideas, and who wonders less at the beauty of the universe than "at the beauty of the human mind itself"; one whose poetry remains important "less for its artistic value, and its influence, than for its psychological significance and its embodiment of the religious ideas of an epoch."

MARJORIE NICOLSON

Smith College

BRIEF MENTION

Englische Wege Zu Kant, by ELSE WENTSCHER. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1931. 86 pp. 3 M. *Die Politische Schulung Des Englischen Volkes*, by HERBERT SCHÖFFLER. Leipzig: B. Tauchnitz, 1931. 38 pp. 1.25 M. These essays are the fourth and fifth numbers in the series "Hefte zur Englandkunde," edited by Prof. Herbert Schöffler of the University of Köln. They are apparently semi-popular in character and contribute nothing new or important to their respective subjects.

Dr. Wentscher seeks to show how English philosophers prepared the way for Kant. The result is a commonplace sketch of English philosophy from Roger Bacon to David Hume in which the familiar relationships are pointed out between the English thinkers and Kant. The frequent evaluations that supplement Dr. Wentscher's expositions indicate that for her the Kantian system, from the synthetic judgment a priori to the categorical imperative, still enjoys virtually exclusive rights to the comparatives "tiefer" and "prinzipieller." Her discussion of Hume and causality demonstrates the necessity of approaching the German master more critically. With Berlin, Göttingen, and Vienna readily available, this should not be so difficult.

Prof. Schöffler gives a brief account of the factors to which he attributes the political abilities of the English people. He mentions prominently the continuity of their political development, the gradual extension of political rights, the high quality of their nobility, the devotion to sports, the relative freedom during the past from economic difficulties, and particularly the presence of active religious minorities. It is these features of England's development rather than some "inherent" capacity which explain the Englishman's supremacy in the field of government and politics.

ALBERT E. BLUMBERG

The Johns Hopkins University

Anthology of Romanticism and Guide Through the Romantic Movement. In Five Volumes. By ERNEST BERNBAUM. New York: Nelson, 1930. About 400 pages each. \$6.00. Each volume is sold separately at \$1.25. Professor Bernbaum's *Guide* constitutes the first volume of this series. Volume II, which is devoted to the Pre-Romantic Movement, contains selections from over eighty writers of the eighteenth century, half of whom are seldom or never represented in the ordinary anthology and would hardly deserve to be enshrined in this one, were it not that the sheer bulk

of their offerings bears impressive testimony to the pervasive character of early romantic influences. Volumes III-V present familiar extracts from sixteen romantic authors, beginning with Blake and ending with the early work of Carlyle.

The *Guide* is a useful and readable handbook, skillfully planned at every point to meet the needs of the college student. A chapter is assigned to each of the sixteen major writers included in the anthology, and another to the Pre-Romantic Movement. Additional chapters survey the whole subject from different points of view. The author explains that he has endeavored to keep his own opinions under restraint, but nevertheless he vigorously and ably defends romanticism—with unnecessary acerbity, perhaps, in the passages which castigate the “neo-neo-classic Dioscuri.”

The last two or three decades have, of course, yielded a considerable amount of new information in regard to the Romantic Movement, and have developed new points of view. Professor Bernbaum has embodied the most important of these results in his biographical and critical observations, and he has added a generous assortment of classified bibliographies with accompanying brief appraisals and occasional citations of reviews or other discussions of the books or articles mentioned. Probably no other single volume covering the same ground is so nearly up to date.

F. E. FARLEY

Wesleyan University

Italy in the Post-Victorian Novel. By H. T. BOILEAU. Philadelphia, 1931. Pp. x + 127. In spite of its alluring and suggestive title, this doctoral dissertation reveals what happens when a thesis is all subject and no predicate. It is a conscientious exercise consisting chiefly of plots of modern British novels whose scenes are laid in Italy or which have Italians as characters. Incidental comments of the most obvious nature relieve the otherwise tedious recital of plot-synopses. Because of the ambiguity of its title and the tangential distractions of books, arbitrarily assembled, which have some reference to Italy or Italians, the work exhibits the pedestrian energy of an industrious and not too reflective reader. Only a reference librarian could check the dissertation's inclusiveness; its exclusiveness is obvious enough since it is limited to *British* novelists. Except for passing allusion, its author ignores American writers like Marion Crawford and Henry James (the former of whom is fairly prolific on the Italian scene), though it is not inconceivable that either or both may have stimulated the *genre* among British novelists. Contributing causes—social, economic, or political—are sedulously avoided. Even the most enlightening comment (p. 37) is questionable: “English both in life and fiction are apt to pick Italy for amours, liaisons and elopements.”

Questions which are ignored: What significance does the Italian *mise en scène* have in the post-Victorian novel? What aesthetic motives lured each of the novelists to select Italy? In what ways does the Italian scene in the modern British novel differ from other national *locales* (non-English) in that novel? Is there any change in the temperament or mood of modern England to account for this renewed interest in Italy? What advance, if any, has been made upon the treatment or function of the Italian scene by living writers over Victorians like George Eliot, Meredith, or Hawthorne, who laid scenes of novels in Italy?

WILLIAM S. KNICKERBOCKER

The University of the South

English Theories of Public Address, 1530-1828. By W. P. SANDFORD. Ohio State University, 1929. Columbus: H. L. Hedrick, 1931. Pp. 212. The increasing scholarly interests of our colleagues in public speaking deserve every encouragement and recognition, especially investigations in the history of their art that throw light on contemporary theories of literature. Professor Sandford's study is careful and methodical; but unfortunately it is only a step on the way rather than an accomplishment; for it is based on very incomplete bibliography. In the Renaissance, though it corrects some misconceptions, it might well have borrowed even more from McGrew's *Bibliography on Works of Speech during the 16th and 17th Centuries*, and should have used the work of Croll, R. F. Jones and others on contemporary prose style. In the later period, it is even more incomplete. No mention appears of works by, or attributed to, Cockin, Cooke, Du-Gard, Gentleman, Knox, Newberry, Mason and Polwhele, or of *The Art of Speaking in Public* (London, 1727), or of Sharp's paper in the *Memoirs of the Manchester Literary Society* (III, 307). Periodical material, even Steele's *Tatler* (Oct. 31, 1710) and Goldsmith's *Bee* (VII) is ignored, as are also such influential French writers as Fénelon, Batteux, Formey, Troublett and Maury. In the histrionic field, it omits Aaron Hill and *The Ladies Magazine* (XX, 290, 425, 472; XXII, 198); and, on pulpit oratory, it omits Langhorne, Dodsley and Sanderman.

JOHN W. DRAPER

West Virginia University

Literary Criticism in America, A Preliminary Survey. By GEORGE E. DE MILLE. New York, 1931. Pp. 288. \$3.50.

A few years ago, in the preface to a study of American criticism, I deplored the lack—amid all our historical studies of literature—

of a history of American criticism; but I restricted my own effort to an analysis of the criteria of four critics, Poe, Emerson, Lowell, and Whitman, with a conclusion concentrating upon contemporary humanism. Mr. De Mille, in his preface, also deplores the lack of a history of American criticism, without which, he asserts, we shall not be able to write the new history of American literature for which the time is ripe; but he restricts his own efforts to a series of brief chapters on *The North American Review*, Lowell, Poe, Emerson and Margaret Fuller, Stedman, Henry James, Howells, Huxner, and Sherman. The treatment is closer to journalism than to substantial scholarship. Our history of criticism is still to seek.

NORMAN FOERSTER

University of Iowa

The Romantic Quest. By H. N. FAIRCHILD. New York: Columbia University Press, 1931. Pp. 444. \$4.50. This volume is a revision and development of a series of lectures in a graduate course at the Columbia Summer School. It deals with the thought of the romantic poets, summing up many recent studies of influences more adequately than any other general survey, and adding a fair amount of original material. Some of the best examples of this new material are a new (and unconvincing) definition of romanticism, an account of the influence of the philosopher Drummond on Shelley, and a new anti-intellectualist interpretation of Keats, which is likely to receive a hostile reception.

T. M. RAYSOR

University of Nebraska

Modern Continental Playwrights. By FRANK W. CHANDLER. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1931. Pp. xi + 711. \$3.00. This helpful book is descriptive rather than historical or, except incidentally, critical. Drawing on his wide and first-hand acquaintance with modern dramatic literature, Professor Chandler reports on the chief continental practitioners from Ibsen to Pirandello. His method is to summarize the most important works of each, relate them to the main dramatic currents, and estimate concisely the author's significance and merit. His attitude is consistently objective: he plays no favorites. The result is a sensible book, which is readable throughout and contains an immense amount of information. A bibliography of eighty-five pages and an index of thirty add to the value of this excellent handbook.

H. S.
